

THE  
QUARTERLY REVIEW  
OF  
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH.

JULY, 1888.

---

ARTICLE I.

ORIGINAL SIN.\*

By REV. J. B. REIMENSNYDER, D. D., New York.

I congratulate the Seminary and the General Synod of the Lutheran Church on the establishment of these lectures on the Augsburg Confession through the liberality and far-seeing wisdom of Dr. Holman. It is a hopeful sign of the times when we see this returning appreciation of the great confessions of Christendom, and of the distinctive Lutheran consciousness. The reaction from the end of extreme confessional indifference—by one of the primal laws of thought—was sure to set in. Its coming was only a question of time. Let us rejoice that it is already here. In the Augustana the Lutheran Church has its most glorious treasure. The great American historian of creeds says of it: "The Augsburg Confession will ever be cherished as one of the noblest monuments of faith from the Pentecostal period to Protestantism. It struck the key-note to the other evangelical confessions."† Let it then be to Lutherans a task

\*Holman Lecture on the Augsburg Confession (Second Series), II. Article, delivered in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa., May 1, 1888.

†Schaff's *Creeds of Christendom*, Vol. 1, p. 235.

of love to search into, and hold up to Christendom, its spiritual riches.

And there is another reason why this is a subject for gratulation. That is, because it involves the study and *esteem of Christian doctrine*. We live in an age when the tendency of many is to disparage doctrine. The spirit, the practice, the life, cry they, are every thing; as if there could be a spirit where there is no body; a practice, where there is no rule; a life, where there is no faith. It is not true, as charged, that there is a natural connection between pure, scriptural doctrine, and cold, dead formality. If this were true it would invalidate and stultify the whole Christian system. But it is the railing of empty minds and unspiritual souls. Orthodoxy and orthopraxy should, and do, as a rule, go together. The prejudice against theology, *i. e.* against the systematic and scientific correlating of Christian doctrine, is illogical. To know a thing thoroughly, in its depth and fullness, and to comprehend it symmetrically, do not destroy its force, but give it more concentrated and powerful impact upon the conscience. He who thinks most logically also acts most practically. I am glad that such a great lay-thinker,—who surely also is not an impractical idealist,—as Gladstone, fully catches this thought, which even so many clergymen miss, as he states it in his reply to Prof. Huxley, thus: "Those who take for the burden of their song: Respect Religion, but despise Theology, seem to me just as irrational as if a person were to say, Admire the trees, the plants, the flowers, the sun, moon, or stars, but despise Botany and despise Astronomy." Theology is *ordered knowledge*: representing in the region of the intellect what religion represents in the heart and life of man." So also writes a prominent non-Lutheran divine in a late number of that popular publication, the *Homiletic Review*: "Theological Science co-ordinates revealed facts into a thorough consistent system. This is the work of systematic theology, and it is sheer ignorance, advertising its voice as that of a dunce, which rails at systematic theology as a mere logomachy of the schools."\* And one of our own divines has lately given forcible expression to this often

---

\*Rev. J. L. Witherow, D. D., Vol. XV., No. 1, p. 6.

abused truth thus: "It is a slander to say, as has been said, that the 'churches are dying of theology.' The converse is true. The churches are dying for want of theology.' Theology, doctrine, is the life-blood of the Church, and many are weak and sickly and are oscillating to and fro, because doctrinal preaching has well-nigh departed from our pulpit."\* The noblest and most richly fruitful labor in the world, then, is that which occupies itself with bringing out in "the form of sound words" (2 Tim. 1 : 13) the precious doctrines lying deep down in the mines of God's revelation to man.

The subject of which the Second Article of the Augsburg Confession treats, and which we are now to discuss,—Original Sin,—is one of the most *recondite* that can engage human thought. Neander says of it: "The most difficult of all questions is this, Whence, in that human nature which feels itself attracted by the good, which is conscious of it as its original essence, whence the *evil* in it?"† Naturally we enter with diffidence upon an inquiry relating to the subtlest truths underlying our existence, and which has exercised the acutest powers of the ablest minds in all ages. We would remember, too, that we have been preceded in this discussion by one of the keenest theological thinkers in this country, who was the first nominee on this foundation, 21 years ago.‡ But arduous as is the task, we will endeavor to meet it as fully as is in our power. Acuteness and balance of understanding are needed here, but more especially divine grace: "For the spirit searcheth all things, yea, the deep things of God" (1 Cor. 2 : 10).

1. Original Sin, is a *fact*. It undoubtedly exists and always has existed. To support certain theories this has indeed been denied. Yet to do so is to resist the plainest demonstration of the senses. Mankind is universally corrupt. A perfect human being is never found. Every one bears the marks and characteristics of moral infirmity. No one aspect of human nature is more conspicuous than sinfulness. Especially is this seen in a state of nature. Rousseau, attributing the prevalence

\*Prof. J. W. Richard, D. D., in *Wittenberg Theological Monthly*, p. 9.

†History of the Christian Church, Vol. II., 565.

‡Rev. S. S. Sprecher, D. D., LL. D.

of depravity to the corrupting influence of civilization, advocated as the remedy a return to nature. But this natural state is just the theatre of every moral abomination. And left to itself, history shows that no nation has been morally lifted up. But the constant tendency is to deeper degradation, so that we see "whole nations giving themselves up to the consuming fire of the wildest passions, or sunk in a slow indifference to existence, like petrifications in the world of mind."\* There have indeed been noble exceptions among the heathen, pure Pagan moralists, blind seekers after God, but these still have had their imperfections, and bore witness to the invariable rule. Actions, too, are not to be determined by outward correctness, but by their motive. And thus a moral act, not inspired by godly love or fear, often becomes in essence, immoral and impious. Now how is it possible that of all the countless race of men not one is found perfect in moral character except on the hypothesis that sin is inborn, that the gate of entrance into the world leaves its stain upon every one that passes it.

A further proof of original sin arises from the *dispositions observed in children*. In early infancy, before evil could have been learned from observation, it manifests itself. An innate wrongful bent is disclosed, requiring correction. Pain, sickness and infirmity, too, appear in little children, which are not the fruit of any actual sins of their own.

The *universality of death* is yet another evidence. All die. None escape this dire penalty. Now if sin were not innate but acquired, it is inconceivable but that some would be absolutely pure, and thus, above moral corruption, would also be beyond the reach of physical death. So strong are these considerations that the philosopher Kant in his essay on Inborn Depravity admits and demonstrates its reality. Original Sin is then an incontrovertible fact. The Scriptures are right that: "There is none that doeth good no not one" (Ps. 14 : 2), and "Every imagination of the thoughts of man's heart is only evil continually" (Gen. 6 : 5).

Admitted, then, the fact of Original Sin,—the universal de-

---

\**Christian Dogmatics*, Martensen, p. 176.



pravity of mankind,—what is its explanation? How are we to account for this phenomenon? Whence this disharmony in the human spirit, these strange antagonisms, these traces of a higher obscured by a predominating lower nature? Here human reason is utterly at fault. As science, when it has pushed its daring spirit of investigation to secondary causes, stands baffled and lost when its feet touch the boundless ocean of the Great First Cause, so it is here. Philosophy cannot solve this mystery. It has not even a theory to offer. The *a priori* postulate of reason is that God is good, that man,—God's workmanship,—must therefore be good and perfect, and Original Sin thus appears as a sheer anomaly. It is absolutely unaccountable. We are accordingly here driven to the only resort, revelation. The Bible assumes to be the word of God. And almost on its first page, we find the explanation of this else insoluble enigma. According to the Biblical narrative, God created man holy and pure. Adam was endowed with original righteousness. He was invested with the image of God. This consisted in holiness and freedom. Before this, Satan, an evil spirit, had fallen. He tempted man, who, abusing his freedom, likewise fell. By this door sin entered into the world and tainted the entire human race. Such is the simple, straightforward Biblical account. It is told in a few lines, which however are weighted with the sublimest truths. And here, then, we have a satisfactory and full explanation. This brief narrative unfolds the mystery. God is vindicated. Satan and man are responsible. Original Sin becomes explicable. Its cause lies uncovered.

Much discussion has raged as to whether this Mosaic account of the fall is historical or mythical. Even those who have contended for the latter have been forced to admit the "profound psychological penetration" disclosed in it. I need scarcely say that orthodox Christians conceive it to be a veritable history. It has no mythical feature, but every concomitant of intensely sober, real history,—history too solemn and terrible to be trifled with under the mask of allegory. Not only is it not a fable, but one of the most conclusive illustrations of the uniqueness of the Bible, viz, that its writings are given with God's finger.

II. Accepting the Biblical history of the fact, what is the

*History of Original Sin as a Doctrine?* In the primitive Church there was no attempt to give it formal theological statement. It was simply assumed and held as a fact, without effort to correlate it in any doctrinal system. As a distinct tenet of theology its development was gradual. The apostolic Fathers do not definitely mention it. Justin Martyr in general terms bewails the universality of sin. Clement of Alexandria speaks more particularly of voluntary and "involuntary sins, sins of weakness and mistakes,"\* by which latter he refers to Original Sin. Tertullian is the first to speak of it by the specific phrase, "*vitium originis*." Origen, against the skeptic Celsus, adduces the example of the prophets "offering a sacrifice for new-born infants, as not being free from sin."† Athanasius thought there were exceptions to universal depravity, as Jeremiah and John. And Cyril of Jerusalem, Basil the Great, and others, held more or less similarly loose views. The Fathers of the later Nicene Age, as Hilary and Ambrose, teach the defilement of sin by birth, the latter affecting it. Ps. 51 : 5. In general, however, as Hagenbach remarks, the tendency was so great to regard sin as the direct act of the free will, that the Fathers of this era could hardly look upon it as simply a hereditary tendency. But while such great thinkers as Irenæus, Tertullian, and Origen, gave more precise form to the conception of Original Sin, it was reserved for that rare personality, Augustine, in whom great original genius and deep piety were so beautifully blended, to give this doctrine its fullest and most accurate statement. Pelagius denied that men were born with sin. He considered the "sin of Adam as injuring only himself and not the human race; that new-born infants are in the same condition that Adam was before the transgression; and that the human race does not die in consequence of Adam's death and transgression."‡ Augustine opposed these positions as heretical. The whole Christian world was agitated with the conflict. The Christian consciousness sided with Augustine. Finally, in 418 A. D., Pope Zosimus, who had previously exonerated,—a remarkable illustration of Papal Infallibil-

\**Stromata*, Book II, Chapters 14 and 15.

†*Origen vs. Celsus*, Book VII., Chap. 1.

‡*On Pelagius*, Chap. 65, Post-Nicene Fathers, Vol. V., p. 211.

ity,—condemned Pelagianism as heresy. Thus Original Sin was established as an orthodox doctrine in the Christian Church. "That doctrine," says Neander, "conquered which had on its side the voice of the universal Christian consciousness—the whole life and experience of the Church as expressed in its prayers and in all its liturgical forms."\*

During the Middle Ages, the Greek, or Eastern Church, as represented by John of Damascene, leaned toward a mild Pelagianism, but the tone of the Western Church was decidedly Augustinian. There were exceptions, as Abelard, who denied that sin, as such, could be attributed to infants. But Anselm, Thomas Aquinas, St. Bernard, and others, stamped such views as heretical.

At the Reformation, there were some differences between the Evangelical party and the Romanists. The latter appeared to teach that only the punishment, the *reatus*, but not the guilt of the fall attached to Adam's posterity. They looked upon its evil effects not as a fault or corruption of nature, but only as servitude, or condition of mortality. So Dr. Shedd, in his "History of Christian Doctrine," and Guericke, in his "Symbolic," contend. This was also the opinion held by Zwingle. But, on the whole, the difference was one more of logomachy than of reality. So that justice warrants the conclusion of Dr. Hodge: "From all this it appears that although the doctrine of the Romish Church is neither logical nor self-consistent, it is nevertheless true that that Church does teach the doctrine of Original Sin, in the sense of innate, hereditary sinfulness."† Subsequently, the Pietists, though not formal theologians, were impelled by their deeply pious sentiments to the same convictions.

In the 18th century, in the era of Illumination and Rationalism, so-called "*enlightened*" theologians erased the doctrine of Original Sin from their systems." But with the returning ascendancy of evangelical truth in Germany and elsewhere, the orthodox doctrine of the Church has been reinstated in Christendom, and will doubtless prevail through all time.

---

\**History of the Christian Church*, Vol. I., p. 599.

†*Systematic Theology*, Vol. II, p. 180.

With these prefatory statements the ground is cleared for the discussion of the precise doctrinal statement of Original Sin as given in the Augsburg Confession. This was its first authoritative confessional statement. For the doctrine is not touched upon in the three Œcumenical Creeds. Nor was it distinctly treated of in the Tetrapolitan Confession presented at Augsburg by the Reformed. In the Schwabach Articles of the preceding year, 1529, which grew out of the Marburg Colloquy and were principally prepared by Luther, the doctrine is formulated essentially as we find it in the Augustana.

III. The Confession first directs us to the CAUSE AND SOURCE of Original Sin. Our Churches "teach that after Adam's fall, all men begotten after the common course of nature, are born with sin." The confessors here plant themselves unequivocally upon the word of God, the basis and rule of faith. They accept the Mosaic narrative as literal history. The fall of Adam, the father of the human race, was the originating cause of Original Sin. By the perversion of his freedom he lost his original holiness, and the fountain of human nature thus corrupted, the entire stream of humanity was polluted. The hypothesis of the ancients, so natural, as judging from the phenomena of blended right and wrong—of a God of good and a God of evil, an antagonism between eternal powers of light and darkness, is definitively rejected here. But man is himself held responsible for this great mundane calamity, Adam's voluntary act—deliberate, because he knew the consequence, and could have done otherwise—was the cause of Original Sin. He did the deed and "Earth felt the wound, and nature from her seat, sighing, through all her works gave signs of woe, that all was lost."

And the *means* by which this sin is visited upon his posterity is *natural generation*. "All men begotten after the common course of nature, are born with sin." That is, it is transmitted in birth. Such is the declaration of scripture: "Behold I was shapen in iniquity; and in sin did my mother conceive me" (Ps. 51: 5). "We were by nature the children of wrath, even as others" (Ephes. 2: 3). Hence it is called "birth-sin;" original sin, *i. e.* the "sin of origin;" "capital sin," *i. e.* the head or fountain sin. In connection with this transmission of moral pollu-

tion to the newly born being, the speculative spirit of the human mind raised the question: How does the soul itself originate in birth? And here arose the respective theories of Creationism and Traductionism. The former holds that each soul is absolutely and independently created at birth and united with the body. The latter that the soul is propagated by traduction, *i. e.* spiritually transmitted from the soul of the parent. The inquiry leads us into those awful deeps of the secret divine laboratory where we must gaze with caution and reverence. So Augustine wisely advises: "Where Scripture gives no certain testimony, human presumption must beware how it decides in favor of one side or the other."\* However, the Lutherans generally inclined with Luther toward Traductionism and the Reformed with Calvin toward Creationism. Thus says Dörner: "The view that souls originate by generation was usually adopted as an auxiliary tenet to the Original Sin theory of Lutheran Theology."† And we cannot but think their view correct. Traductionism seems indeed to represent the soul after a sensuous manner, and to put the creative agency a step further back in the chain of causality. But on the other hand, Creationism would involve the absolute freedom from moral taint of the soul fresh from the divine creative mould, and so would conflict with the Scriptural doctrine of Original Sin. The argument of analogy from the body, and also that from experience—children reproducing the particular moral traits and mental characteristics of their parents, just as they show the symptoms of hereditary disease—tend to sustain the theory of soul-traduction. We may therefore conclude with Quenstedt: "The soul of the first man was immediately created by God, but the souls of the rest of men are created *per traducem* (*i. e.* through propagation) by their parents."‡ Thus parents are the real progenitors of their children, body and soul, and they and not God, are the authors of their physical and spiritual defects.

IV. The NATURE of Original Sin is the next topic of the

\**De Peccatorum*, III, §59.

†*Protestant Theology*, Vol. II, 144.

‡*Schmid's Ency. Luth. Doctrinal Theology*, Hay and Jacobs, p. 187.

Confession: "that is, without the fear of God, without trust in him, and with fleshly appetite." The Confessors here properly apply to Original Sin descriptive terms which characterize a state rather than an action. And this is the first definition of Original Sin. It is not a sinful deed, but a sinful condition, propensity, state. The Roman Confutation, indeed, takes issue with the Confession here, saying, "that to be without the fear of God, and without trust in God is rather the actual guilt of an adult than the offence of a recently born infant."\* But they fail to adduce their reasons, and the charge is manifestly groundless.

Let us examine the state which these terms define. "Without fear of, or trust in God." That is, it is *negative*. Those tendencies natural to man in his uncreated original righteousness are lacking. He is born destitute of spiritual nature. In him "dwelleth no good thing" (Rom. 7 : 18). There is a "totalis carentia virium spiritualium." But it is also a condition *positively* evil. "And with fleshly appetite." "Concupiscentia" is the Latin term of the Confession, which, following the English version of Dr. Krauth, is thus translated. It could not perhaps be better rendered than, as here, by "fleshly appetite" as carnal desire. It was a word taken from the theological nomenclature of the scholastics, and well fitted for its task. It aptly expresses that "*fomes*" or evil longing, that inflammatory readiness, that innate propensity to sin, which at the first spark of temptation will kindle into actual transgression. The Apology of the Augsburg Confession calls it that "constant evil inclination of the nature."† To this indwelling evil propensity St. Paul refers in the words: "I find then a law that when I would do good, evil is present with me" (Rom. 7 : 21). This sinful state is then not only negative but positive. Not mere weakness, defect, infirmity, but inclination toward evil, opposition to all that is holy and righteous. Frailty, impurity, perversity and impiety are here wrapped up in embryonic form. It is a seed full of dire possibilities, a Pandora's box, which needs but devel-

\* *Confutation of the Augsburg Confession*: Book of Concord, Jacobs, II, 210.

† *Book of Concord*, Vol. I, Art. II, p. 76, Jacobs.

oping consciousness to uncover and set on fire its brood of woe-ful evils. To this aspect it owes its specific name as the source or origin, or originating cause of all actual sin.

Luthardt, applying this threefold negative and positive description of Original Sin to diverse heresies in the theological arena, makes this apt classification. The want of fear, *i. e.* pride, is manifest in the spirit denying a personal God, Pantheism; the want of faith, or the destructive, critical spirit, is exhibited in Rationalism; and the longing of concupiscence is shown in the sensual conceptions of Materialism.\*

This depraved condition, moreover, is *bodily*. Indeed its chief seat is in the body. Christianity, while rejecting the Pagan opinion that the body was naturally evil as opposed to the soul, still must and does recognize it as peculiarly prone to sin. Therefore says the Scripture: "The spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak" (Matt. 26 : 41). Again, "Abstain from fleshly lusts which war against the soul" (1 Pet. 2 : 11). So St. Paul tells us of "The law in my members warring against the law of my mind" (Rom. 7 : 23). The appetites of the body are perverted from pure desires to lawless and unhallowed lusts. And by the occasion of these carnal motions, how often man is ensnared into sin. But it is also *spiritual*. The soul as well as the body has experienced the injury of the fall. The spiritual perceptions and powers are inert, and inclined to evil.

Thus this corruption is *total*. It affects all the members of the body, and all the faculties of the soul. The heart is depraved, the mind is darkened, the will is weakened. The will is perhaps the most injured of the spiritual powers; since even what the understanding discerns and the judgment advises, it persistently refuses to perform. The entire personality of man is therefore infected and corrupted in the very innermost parts and profoundest recesses of the being. In the more detailed language of the Form of Concord: "The whole nature of man is entirely and to the furthest extent corrupted and perverted by Original Sin in body and soul."\*

---

\**Moral Truths of Christianity*, p. 73.

\**Part II*, p. 545 (Dr. Jacobs' edition).



This depravity, further, is *tenacious*. It inheres about the very roots of the soul's being and cannot be gotten rid of. Left alone, this state will not grow better, but worse. It is incorrigible. It cannot be utterly extirpated. Even in the good man it still smoulders, and ever and anon stirs with the dangerous might of a subterranean ocean. It persists all through life. The material of it cannot be destroyed until death. And even then, its deadly taint by virtue of its feature of transmissibility, is perpetuated in the ills of posterity.

Such is this total and horrible corruption of human nature by means of Original Sin. May we not truly say, as we contemplate this galling burden with which every soul "begotten after the common course of nature" must enter the world: "O wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death" (Rom. 7 : 24). Yet we must avoid the extreme of falling into the Manichean heresy, which was revived also in modern times by Flacius, that the very *substance* of human nature is corrupted by Original Sin. If this were the case man would wholly cease to be man. It is indeed now become natural to us, but not that it has utterly destroyed our original powers, but only entwined itself inseparably about them. It is indwelling sin, but not the substance of man. The essential human nature God created, and that still remains as the basis for renovation. If the very substance of man, *i. e.* those characteristics which constitute him a spiritual being—freedom, reason, conscience—were sin itself, he would no longer be a rational soul, a responsible agent. Hence this corruption is called in theological parlance that of *accident*. By this it is meant that it is not the soul itself, but only a quality, a condition of it. As the most virulent disease is not the body, but is only fastened upon it, so Original Sin is but an accident or property of human nature. It is "indwelling" sin and as Quenstedt finely says: "As the inhabitant is not the house, so sin is not the man." While then our inquiry leads us to the strong language of the Smalcald Articles: "This hereditary sin is so deep and terrible a corruption of nature, that no reason can understand it, but it must be believed from the revelation of the Scriptures" (Part III, Art. I), we rejoice to temper this statement by the asser-



tion of the Form of Concord that we must distinguish "the nature and essence of the corrupted man which are the creatures of God, and Original Sin, which is a work of the devil" (Part II).\*

V. Is this Original Sin *really and properly sin*? Is it sin in the true sense of guilt, culpability, and desert of punishment? This is the centre of the discussion, and the veritable *crux* of theology. No more difficult problem than this confronts us in the whole field of theological thought. In general, two views have been held by theologians. One school has asserted that Original Sin is no more than an impaired moral constitution, a natural infirmity, a misfortune, "*debitum*," involving personal fault, *i. e.* not truly sin. The other school has held it to be true and proper sin, involving guilt and deserving punishment.

The early Church Fathers rather inclined to the former theory, and did not consider it essentially sin. Thus, Tertullian, while admitting the presence of inherent depravity in children, holds it not to be a guilty condition. Cyprian, in the epistle to Fidus on the Baptism of Infants, draws a clear moral distinction between their corruption and sin.† So also Clement of Alexandria. In general, they do not deem the state of natural depravity to be invested with moral accountability. Augustine first protested against the expression "*peccatum naturale*," and used the phrase "*peccatum vere*," and argued that Original Sin was sin in the proper sense. Pelagius on the other hand protested that there could be no natural propagation of sin, as guilt could not inhere to a process of nature, but only to an act of the will. Orthodoxy decided with Augustine. Still at the Reformation we find Zwingli with his rationalistic habit of thought asserting that Original Sin is "only such a defect as comes by accident." The heretic Socinus taught that "there is no Original Sin, but Original Evil, which, however, involves no personal accountabil-

\*"*Substance* in its logical and metaphysical sense, is that nature of a thing which may be conceived to remain, after every other nature is removed or abstracted from it. *Accident* denotes all those ideas which the analysis excludes as not belonging to the mere being or nature of the object."—*Hampden Bampton Lectures*, VII, p. 337.

†*Ante-Nicene Fathers*, Cyprian LVIII, Vol. V, p. 354.

ity."\* With the theology of the era of Illumination "Original Sin was a mere matter of natural necessity, so that the idea of responsibility was destroyed, and a doctrine introduced which would prove fatal to the ethical standpoint which rationalism had maintained from regard to practical morality."† Still, as we have said, the general voice of the Christian Church has held Original Sin to be "*peccatum vere*." Even the liberal Savonarola wrote: "Original Sin is the root of all sins, the *fomes* of all iniquity."‡ The language of the Confession is here positive and unmistakable. "And, that this disease, or original fault is *truly sin*, condemning and bringing eternal death. \* \* They condemn the Pelagians and others who deny this original fault to be sin indeed." This position the Roman Catholic Confutation endorses thus: "We approve their Confession, in common with the Catholic Church, that the fault of origin is truly sin."§ So also the Form of Concord, Part II: "It is necessary that Christians should not only regard as sins their actual transgressions of God's commands, but also that the dreadful hereditary malady by which the entire nature is corrupted, should above all things be regarded as sin." Thus, too, a typical non-Lutheran, the Westminster Confession, Chap. VI: "This corruption of nature,—both itself, and all the motions thereof—is truly and properly sin." The proofs that Original Sin is truly sin are these: first, the *Scriptures*. The *locus classicus* here is Rom. 5 : 12: "So death passed upon all men, *for that all have sinned*."|| Here, and in all the ensuing argumentations of the apostle, death, which is the penalty of Original Sin, is declared to be inflicted on account of the guilt of this sin. Hence it is verita-

\*Hagenbach's *History of Doctrine*, Vol. II, p. 485.

†Kurtz's *Church History*, Vol. II, p. 160.

‡Mere's Savonarola, p. 260.

§Book of Concord, Jacobs, Vol. II, p. 210.

|| εφ' ᾧ πάντες ἥμαρτον, on which Alford comments, literally, 'in ground of,' 'on condition of = BECAUSE 'all sinned,' not 'were sinful,' or 'were born in sin'—sin is here *original*, as planted in the nature by the sin of our forefathers." Similarly also Ellicott: "For that, or because all sinned, *i. e.* implicitly in Adam's transgression." Commentaries, Vol. II, p. 225.

ble sin. And so throughout Scripture. In Rom. 7, Paul calls man's natural hereditary corruption sin, no less than 14 times.

Again, it bears the *marks or characteristics of sin*. This original taint is inherently evil and immoral. It is by nature carnally and satanically inclined. It is but the passive side of sin and is of one essence with the active side. A stream is not radically diverse from its source. The root and the trunk are not different in character but equally component parts of the tree. So the corrupt state, and the evil act, are not morally diverse, but are the equally constituted elements of true sin. How can the original taint be moral evil at all if it be not a truly vile, wicked and sinful propensity of the soul?

Another ground is *consciousness*. We feel that this evil state in us is culpable. Our conscience accuses us for it. Experience moves us to confess its guilt and to mourn over it. The conviction of the truly pious is that of Luther, learned from the depths of his own bitter personal experience. He says: "Original Sin is the real and chief sin; if that were not, there were no actual sins. This sin is not committed like other sins; but it is, it lives, and does all other sins, and is the essential sin."\* A further proof is that *the wrath of God* rests upon it. "So Death passed upon all men." Now as it is an undeniable fact that God visits punishment and death upon Original Sin, it is more natural to conclude that he punishes that which is guilty than that which is innocent, and hence it must be sin indeed.

Dr. C. P. Krauth thus summarizes the proofs:

"We argue that Original Sin is truly sin:

1. Because it has the *relations* and connections of sin.
2. It has the *name* and synonyms of sin.
3. It has the *essence* of sin.
4. It has the *attributes* of sin.
5. It does the *acts* of sin.
6. It incurs the *penalties* of sin.
7. It needs the *remedies* of sin.
8. Consequently, it is conformed to a true *definition* of sin."†

\**Werke*, XI, p. 336.

†*Conservative Reformation and its Theology*, pp. 398, 399.

These heads he then develops with characteristic fullness and acuteness.

So far all seems clear and simple. But there are undoubted arguments to be adduced on the other side. Julian of Eclanum, the disciple of Pelagius, pressed the argument that if human nature was tainted from birth, and this concupiscence was culpable or actual sin, then God, as the creator of human nature, became the Author of sin, which is contrary to his holiness; and punished the sin he had necessitated, which is contrary to his justice.\* To this the reply is made that God did make man originally pure, and that now souls are not independently created, but are propagated by generation, and innate depravity, which is real sin, thereby comes upon them not from God, but from the guilt of the race.

But the further question then arises: How can we be held responsible for Adam's sin, when it was not our own personal act? Is not the paramount distinction of sin that it be voluntary? And here even Augustine makes the admission: "The will is the original cause of sin. Where there is no moral freedom there can be no sin."† To escape from this difficulty there has arisen the theory of *imputation*. That is, as Adam was the federal head of the race, and the race is one integral whole, he sinned as our representative, and the sin of the race generically becomes its sin individually. This hypothesis, in which there apparently lies great force,—since we are willing to accept the good at one progenitor's hands, and why not then the evil?—was pushed to such an extreme by the intensely logical, Jonathan Edwards, that he even contends that Adam's act was ours in the sense that we did it voluntarily. To this Dr. Hodge replies, that this is manifestly absurd, for how could we act voluntarily when we did not even exist! Quenstedt, Gerhard and other of the Lutheran theologians sustain the theory of Imputation. Dr. Dorner, however, whose Lutheranism, in some respects, is far from infallible, remarks unfavorably: "At this point, the post-Reformation era advanced beyond the Con-

\*Neander's *History of the Christian Church*, Vol. II, p. 600.

†*De Lib. Arbitrium*, III, 49.

fessions, which had been satisfied with admitting the *indirect* imputation of Adam's sin. Dr. C. P. Krauth is here in accord with Dr. Dörner, for he praises the "scripture-like reticence" of the Confession on Imputation, and calls it "a theory, (which) belongs to scientific theology \* \* as distinguished from the sphere of faith, and to that it should be referred."\* St. Paul states the true, guarded, evangelical doctrine of imputation in a single verse, putting Christ's imputed merit over against Adam's imputed guilt thus: "For, as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous" (Rom. 5 : 19).

As regards the point that true sin must be *voluntary*, the answer is further made by some theologians that sin may be voluntary either subjectively, as it inheres in the root or stock of the human race, or effectively, as it proceeds from deliberate volition. And we know that individual sins grow to be committed from such a habit or fixed moral state, that we do them unconsciously, with no deliberate intent or volition at the time. They are therefore practically involuntary, though still sinful. Similarly, sins of spontaneous impulse, of sudden, violent passion, may often be considered involuntary and yet culpable. Nevertheless, that great difficulties present themselves here is undeniable. Julius Mueller in his great classic on Sin, and the philosopher Schelling, to escape this dilemma, have resorted to the hypothesis of the pre-existence of souls, and their punishment here for their voluntary actions in a former state. But Scripture gives not a hint of this; there is not the faintest reminiscence of it in the soul; and it is directly disproved by the reproduction of hereditary types, dispositions and peculiarities, showing a generic race connection, instead of an independent individuality, such as would be involved in pre-existence.

In general, on the one hand, it may be argued that as objections and difficulties do not destroy the fact of Original Sin, they cannot, either, destroy the doctrine. The moral character of our inborn corrupt dispositions is determined by their nature,

---

\* *Conservative Reformation*, pp. 382, 383.

not by their origin. Sin is sin no matter what be its source. Men are responsible for the moral evil underlying their acts and the groundwork and cause of them, and they cannot throw back this responsibility upon their primal progenitor. In this light, Original Sin is seen to be in accordance with the Confession "truly sin." But on the other hand there are incontestably marked distinctions between Original and Actual Sin. The first Actual Sin was the cause of Original Sin; and the latter is the consequence. Actual Sin is a conscious deed; Original Sin an unconscious state. Actual Sin is voluntary; Original Sin is involuntary. Actual Sin is our own personal deed; Original Sin is the punishment of the deed of another. And while the justice of "condemnation and eternal death" upon Actual Sin is self-evident, such a penalty visited upon a child dying in its corrupt natural state of Original Sin before it had done a single conscious sinful act, is revolting to our conceptions of divine justice. It does not mark it as exceptional from other leading moral facts and problems, when we say, therefore, that there remain inexorable difficulties and mysteries in this doctrine. And we believe the explanation of it is to be found in this, that while Original Sin is truly sin, and under the curse, yet "the Lamb slain from the foundation of the world" (Rev. 13 : 8) and through whom the "trespasses" of mankind were not to be "imputed unto them" (2 Cor. 5 : 19), becomes the means of preventing any infraction of infinite justice. We agree with Brentius that "It is not necessary, neither perhaps is it wise, that we should pryingly inquire how God could so impute the sin of our first parents to their posterity not yet in existence, that they should necessarily be born sinners. For it is enough that the fact is revealed, though the explanation of it be unknown."\*

VI. What are the CONSEQUENCES of Original Sin? As it is truly sin, the punishment of sin is attached to it. So the Confession goes on to declare : "Condemning and bringing eternal death now also upon all that are not born again." The Confession here again simply plants itself wholly upon the divine word. The Scriptures make no distinction between the conse-

---

\*Schmid's *Doctrinal Theology*, p. 261.

quences of Original and Actual Sin, but make the general statement: "For the wages of sin is death," (Rom. 6 : 25). This is first, a spiritual death in time, which, unless arrested, culminates in spiritual death everlasting. The condition of the soul corrupted by Original Sin is one of moral impotence. In theological phrase, this is called a state of inability. Such the Scriptures define it. "Who were *dead* in trespasses and sins," (Ephes. 2 : 1). "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; neither *can* he know them, because they are spiritually discerned" (1 Cor. 2 : 14). Here the paralysis and inability of the spiritual powers are asserted in the strongest manner. And the Confession likewise proceeds: "Our churches condemn the Pelagians who argue that a man may, by the strength of his own reason, be justified before God."

Pelagius did not believe in the utter moral helplessness of man until regenerated by divine grace. He thought the external assistance given by the word was alone necessary, and with this man could work out his salvation. Augustine took the most positive ground as to the absolute inability of man to move in the matter of salvation. God must quicken the inert nature with a new living principle, and carry forward the work which is all of grace. Hence arose the terms Monergism and Synergism. The Greek Fathers were generally synergistic, *i. e.* they believed that man could begin, and that the Holy Spirit thereafter was the only efficient aid in, the work of salvation. The Latin Fathers were generally monergistic, *i. e.* they held that God alone could begin, and that man was but a passive instrument, in salvation. "For no man can recreate himself, any more than in the first instance he could have created himself."

This naturally brought up the question of the *Freedom of the Will*. Has man no power of choice in moral things? Is he to be placed without his own consent under the penal consequence of Original Sin, and then by that same natural depravity, to be bound hand and foot so that he *cannot* free himself from the burden? Unquestionably the letter of the Confessions,—for here all are in harmony,—but allows ability and freedom in *rebus externis*, *i. e.* in temporal or secular affairs, and denies it totally in *rebus spiritualibus*, *i. e.* in moral or spiritual matters. Thus, the



Form of Concord, P. II.: Original Sin "takes away from the unrenewed nature the gifts, the power, and all activity from beginning, and effecting anything in spiritual things." So Luther:—speaking with that characteristic energy which made him at the time oblivious to the necessary limitations of his thoughts, "Yes, these two things, omnipotent power and eternal foresight, fundamentally destroy free-will, so that not a hair of it even is left."\*

If then, all are alike impotent in spiritual things through the paralyzing effect of Original Sin, and yet some are made alive and saved, and others die unregenerate, what causes the difference? Calvin answered: the absolute sovereignty of God by a decree of unconditional election or reprobation. Those whom God operates upon by irresistible grace are saved; the rest are lost. And this, it is contended by Calvinistic theologians, is no injustice on God's part, because he elects some out of pure goodness and merely leaves others to their merited fate. Still, the response of the human consciousness ever has been, and ever will be, that this does conflict with God's revealed attributes of love, justice and impartiality; with the universality of the plan of salvation; with the reality of the offer of grace; and especially with the divine will to save all men as written, "God will have all men to be saved, and to come unto the knowledge of the truth," (1 Tim. 2 : 4.) Besides, the Scriptures teach that man's salvation is conditioned by faith discerned by divine foreknowledge, "Whom he did foreknow he also did predestinate," (Rom. 8 : 29.) And when it is replied that God can only foreknow what must inevitably come to pass, the divine infinite prescience is thereby limited, for it does not require infinitude to foresee the result of laws working with absolute mathematical precision. Such a prescience even acute finite intellect might attain. Nor is it any more satisfactory to contend that certainty is consistent with freedom, namely, that God can make underlying motives so strong as to inevitably influence the will, while the superficial and apparent exercise of it is left free. For this is but the shadow of liberty, the title without the possession, the name

\*Luther's Works, Walch, 434.



without the thing. "By the liberty of a moral agent, I understand a power over the determinations of his own will. But if, in any voluntary action, the determination of the will be the necessary consequence of something involuntary in the state of his mind, he is not free, he has not the liberty of a moral agent, but is subject to necessity."\* Nor is it any better explanation to contend that there may still be freedom where there is no ability. For while it is indeed true, as such argue, that God and the angels are free, yet that they *cannot* sin or fall, still this inability is only moral,—a certainty arising from their holy choice. But man's inability is both natural and moral. His impotence has not arisen originally from his free choice. And in as far as he is not the servant of his individual sin, but of original or race sin, his bondage is one of natural inability and cannot be laid to his charge. And to say, then, that as God is free but cannot sin, so man is free but cannot do good, is clearly a *non-sequitur*. There is no true analogue between the premises. While then Lutheran theology holds fast by the letter of her Confessions that man under the bondage of natural depravity has not a scintillation of spiritual power, it herein departs from the Calvinistic absolute decree, as a theory of necessity, fatal to self-activity and self-responsibility as to salvation.† "Our theologians have said that faith in Christ is the *instrumental cause* of the decree of election." "The doctrine of Calvin is accordingly distinguished from that of the Lutheran Church, in that according to the former, predestination rests upon an absolute decree of God, without a prerequisite condition."‡ And even Augustine in his earlier writings says: "Though sinners on the ground of the universal sin constitute one mass, yet there is a difference, *a something that precedes* their election or reprobation, and the decree is conditioned on these—(*occultissima merita*)—most deeply

\* *Act. Pow.*, Reid's Ency., IV, Ch. 1.

† "The theory that election to salvation, is as President Edwards repeatedly represents it, the 'arbitrary will of God' \* \* is withering to all rational zeal in a preacher's work; and builds a firmament of brass to his prayers. \* \* If the *animus* of such a theology were to control the pulpit, for all redemptive working, it would be like an organ in which the motor nerve is paralyzed." *Prof. Austin Phelps, D. D.*

‡ Quenstedt, Schmid's *Doctrinal Theology*, p. 312.

hidden relations of merit." While, therefore, repudiating synergism, Lutheran theology yet believes that there must be some point of contact between the origination, and all, and only, potent agency of the Holy Spirit and man's voluntary self-determination,—some foreseen character distinction, which is the ultimate ground of the infinite and everlasting difference between the saved and the lost. And what this point is—whether it be simply non-resistance, or a state of the receptivity, or movement of faith, or whether it be altogether undiscoverable, does not matter. Divine Sovereignty and Human Freedom, Election and Choice, Absolute Inability and Individual Responsibility, All-efficient Grace and Personal Co-operation, may appear to us irreconcilable. But they do nevertheless co-exist, as we learn both from Scripture and the facts of experience; and in the depths of the mind of God, and in the apocalypse of the universal circle of truth, of which but a fragment appears to us, their harmony doubtless does and will appear. With man this may be impossible, but that does not limit the Divine possibilities. We, therefore, hold it as reconcilable with this uncompromising teaching of the Confession as to human inability to still use the words of the Lutheran Martensen: "Nothing can strictly speaking, be pronounced regarding the condemnation of the individual, unless he himself has made a personal decision, exercising freedom of choice in relation to divine grace, which will redeem him from the power of Original Sin."\* Such also were the opinions of the primitive Church Fathers as represented by Irenæus in his argument against the Pagan idea of Fate, viz: "And not merely in works, but also in faith, has God preserved the will of man free and under his own control, saying, 'According to thy faith be it unto thee.' But if men were incapable of being anything else than just what they were created, then they would be what they are by nature rather than by will, and of necessity, not by choice."† Let it ever be borne in mind, however, that in every age of the revival of deep personal piety and of living, experimental communion with the

\**Christian Dogmatics*, Martensen, p. 206.

†*Irenæus Against Heresies*, chap. XXXVII, § 5 and 6.

Spirit of God, as in the eras of Augustine and Luther, there has been the most emphatic conviction and reassertion of the doctrine of human inability and natural impotence. Far better is it here to err on the side of extreme orthodoxy than to incur the dangers and errors to which Erasmian and Pelagian views, with their exaltation of the human and their depreciation of the divine agency in regeneration, have ever exposed their followers.

VII. The Confession now directs to the REMEDY provided for escaping the guilt and punishment of Original Sin: "Born again by Baptism and the Holy Spirit." That is, the spiritual remedy is *regeneration*, and the means by which it is effected is *Baptism*. Thus teaches the Scripture: "Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God" (John 3 : 5). "Not by works of righteousness which we have done, but according to his mercy he saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost" (Tit. 3 : 5). These statements are explicit. Others define the conditions, repentance and faith. These are not causal but instrumental. The divine order then is, that the consequences of Original Sin are to be removed by the Spirit of God, conferred through the agency of water. Thereby the guilt of Original Sin disappears, so that "the condemnation of eternal death" no longer attaches to it. Its material, however, is not removed. Concupiscence still remains. The carnal tendencies and old sinful inclinations yet survive. However there is a "new creature." The soul is quickened from its moral apathy and death. The Spirit creates not a new human nature, but a new personal consciousness, grafted on the old substantial being. It is the old material but cast in a new die. That this new spiritual life is in the Confession connected with the Holy Sacrament as its means, shows that the Confessors did not hold those loose, depreciatory views of sacramental agency and churchly ordinances which are so flippantly prevalent now. The divine "treasure" is given in "earthen vessels" (2 Cor. 4 : 7), and to disparage the lowly vessel is little less unscriptural and profane than to make light of the grace it conveys. But as against the other extreme, this regenerating grace is not "*ex opere operato*." It is not wrought magically and by the mere ceremonial use of the external means. But, as the

Pietists rightly asserted in their protest against—not a dead orthodoxy, but an unorthodox formalism—it must be attended by faith, and then,—not the faith,—but the Holy Spirit through the water works a conscious, living change, begets a new soul. “The Holy Spirit, given through baptism, begins to put to death the concupiscence and creates new movements in man.”\*

All this is clear when applied to adults, but since the Christian Church administers baptism to *infants*, what is the effect as to them? Here a divergency of views meets us. Zwingli,—approaching, as Hagenbach says, closely to Socinus,—considered the baptism of infants as no more than their formal admission into the Church. Augustine voicing the ancient Church, says: “Baptism cleanses children from Original Sin. It ennobles their nature.”† “Infants were not only delivered from the punishment of sin but had imparted to them a divine regeneration. The remedy amounted to far more than the mere removal of an evil.”‡ Luther says: “We must declare it as a simple fact that a child, which by nature is oppressed with death, begins eternal life at the time of its baptism.”§ Gerhard: “It remains therefore that they are *regenerated*, cleansed from the contagion of Original Sin, and made partakers of eternal life through *Baptism*.”|| “The divines of the Church of England taught the doctrine of baptismal regeneration.”¶ Hodge, speaking for the Presbyterians, says: “Infants have always been baptized for the remission of sins.”\*\*

The confessional preponderance here appears largely to uphold the view, that, in baptism, the guilt of Original Sin is washed from infants, and there is imparted the beginning of the new spiritual life. The spiritual re-creation is thus the analogue of the natural creation. As in the one, life is given but in the most primal germinal powers, so in the other.

But how is this effected, since infants are unconscious and

\**Apology for Augsburg Confession*, Ch. I, Art. II, Book of Concord, Jacobs, Vol. 1, p. 81.

†*Enchir. ad Laurent.*, 43. ‡Neander's *Church History*, Vol. II, 666.

§*House Postil*, Vol. II, p. 337.

||Schmid's *Doctrinal Theology*, Hay and Jacobs, p. 563.

¶*Hagenbach*, Vol. II, 366. \*\**Christian Theology*, Vol. II, 191.

cannot comply with the condition, faith. Augustine answered the Pelagians: "The faith of the Church takes the place of their own faith."\* Luther, followed by the principal Lutheran divines, held to an unconscious faith of infants just as there was an unconscious Original Sin, and pointed to Christ's words: "One of these little ones which believe in me" (Matt. 18 : 6). In practice the Reformed Churches generally adopt the Zwinglian view of infant baptism, deeming it simply a commanded rite, with only a declarative significance; while the Lutherans ascribe to it subjective efficacy. In this, they certainly have Scripture, as they have the Primitive Church on their side. The New Testament always connects regeneration with baptism. Now, when thus speaking, it either includes infant baptism or it does not. If it does not, then Infant Baptism is not scriptural baptism and should be rejected. If, however, these definitions include Infant Baptism, it is a true, full baptism, and carries with it all the spiritual blessings connected with the sacrament. This, as the *Baptist Weekly* remarks, is the only ground on which the ordinance can exist. Take from it its spiritual efficacy and its observance falls, remarks the same journal. And this is notably proved by the decadence of infant baptism in non-Lutheran Churches.

But this efficacy of infant baptism by no means justifies the adult. Arrived at a responsible age, faith and conscious regeneration are necessary. Here the Pietists were right when they insisted on living, experimental piety, but, standing likewise on firm scriptural ground, they referred this change for its source to the grace given and beginning to work in Infant Baptism. I cannot see the force of the suspicions and objections usually raised to the subjective efficacy of Infant Baptism. If the sin of origin, incurred in natural birth, without our guilty consent, condemns us to death, where is the difficulty or injustice, in the view, that what we may call the grace of origin, likewise, without our meritorious consent "offered" in baptism, should wash away the stains of natural depravity and restore to us our lost spiritual life?

---

\*Neander's *Church History*, Vol. II, p. 670.

If this spiritual renewal is dependent on the means, Baptism and the Word, what is the case with *unbaptized infants* and heathen? Is it true, as charged by James Freeman Clarke, that "The unbaptized child goes to hell because of the Original Sin derived from Adam," no less than the worst criminal, and that this is the doctrine of every orthodox denomination in Christendom?"\* That the early Church and the Roman Catholic Church agree that unbaptized infants are lost is undeniable. This, however, our Lutheran theologians reject as opposed to the New Testament teachings respecting children, and as opposed to divine justice and love. They hold that not the want but the contempt of the sacrament condemns. Our duty is bound by the sacrament, but God's grace is not bound. Baptism is ordinarily but not absolutely necessary to regeneration and salvation.† The unbaptized infant must indeed be cleansed before it enters heaven. But this God can do in death, or in his own time and way. Infants dying unbaptized are saved.

As to the *salvability of the heathen*, lying in Original and Actual Sin, that seems a just view which supposes that their everlasting state will not be finally sealed until Christ be preached to them. Such *seems* to be the meaning of those passages which speak of their being judged "without law" (Rom. 2 : 12), and of Christ preaching unto the spirits in prison" (1 Pet. 3 : 19), and of "the Gospel being preached to them that are dead" as also of the "Tree of Life, whose leaves are for the healing of the nations (Rev. 22 : 2), and which is located in eternity (1 Pet. 4 : 6). Luther, while protesting against the deadly, unscriptural error of a second probation for those who had the Gospel in time, yet admitted the possibility of a limited future probation for such as never had such an opportunity.‡ If Dr. Dorner's view, so much criticised, means more than such a surmise, then it is unscriptural. All this, however, is but hypothesis, and yet, I think, a hypothesis which more irrevocably seals the endless doom of those who voluntarily reject Christ. Nor should this hope en-

\**Orthodoxy*, pp. 357 and 358.

†Gerhard, *Schmid's Doctrinal Theology*, p. 570.

‡Luther's Letters, *Doom Eternal*, p. 304. Who would doubt, he says, that God could give faith to some in dying, or after death? "But that he does it no one can prove."

tertained with humility—dogmatically asserted, it is generally a twin-sister of heresy—affect in the least the necessity and urgency of Foreign Missions. Assuredly the command of Christ, the consolations and hopes of the blessed Gospel, the riches of Christian civilization to suffering heathen, and the glory of God and his Church, are sufficient motives.\*

On the whole, this divine offer freely made "to all nations" (Math. 28 : 19) to have their natural depravity cleansed and to be "born again by baptism and the Holy Spirit," is the blessed explanation of the dark and fearful problem of Original Sin. Yea! the remedy is even greater than the disease. "But not as the offence so also is the free gift, for if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one man, Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many" (Rom. 5 : 15).

VIII. The *practical aspects* of the subject of this II<sup>nd</sup> Article of the Augsburg Confession are of intense significance. Selecting from the many that crowd upon the mind, I can but in conclusion remark one which pertains to *Christian Theology*. Says one: "At present, the regeneration of the Church and of Theology is chiefly to be expected from a right understanding of the doctrine concerning sin." And this is true. There is,—especially in America, where the want of a reflective habit of thought among the clergy is notable—a manifest weakness of definite and positive convictions respecting Original Sin. The disposition is to regard it after a Pelagian manner, as a mere infirmity, misfortune, or tendency, without specific moral character. And as the line where it passes into Actual Sin is an indiscernible one, so the conceptions respecting the enormity, the guilt and danger of Actual Sin, are correspondingly weaker.

And as the doctrines of Revelation constitute an integral system, other fundamental doctrines at once suffer. Where sin is

---

\*I trust that no one, from this assertion, will suspect me of latitudinarianism with respect to the final state of the impenitent. An examination of my views, elaborately set forth in a special work on this subject, will satisfy any one that I stand here upon the faith of the Church universal, as impregably grounded upon Scripture and Reason, and as confessed in the creeds of Christendom.



felt to be but a light evil, low views prevail as to the nature and endlessness of punishment. And where the penalty is minimized, the infinite necessity and value of the Redeemer from sin, are abridged. "The more," says a Church historian, "the doctrine of the Natural Depravity of mankind was lost sight of, and the nature of man elevated, the more the difference between Christ and men, *i. e.* his divinity disappeared." And this is as true of the present as it was of the past. The glory of Christ and the unique blessedness of human redemption are inseparably bound up with sound convictions as to Original Sin. And similarly is affected the need of a deep, thorough-going, vital regeneration. Where the disease is grave, the diagnosis will be serious, and the cure must be radical. But here the reverse is the case, the grievous error will be committed of attempting to "heal the hurt of the daughter of my people slightly" (Jer. 6 : 14).

And we must now encounter a New Theology which seeks to subvert these old evangelical foundations. As Rothe with a striking profundity remarks: "What strange beings men are, that to them God should become small in proportion as the world becomes great."\* This paradox is illustrated by that modern theology, which, as science becomes richer and more brilliant, would attenuate religion. "Progressive Orthodoxy" would cripple inspiration, allegorize miracles, impair the force of Scripture doctrine, volatilize the visible Church, dispossess the sacraments of their spiritual gifts, &c. This danger is real and vital, and I rejoice that so able a non-Lutheran as Dr. A. A. Hodge thus detects and exposes it: "It is evident that this New Theology rests solely upon a passing Speculative Philosophy of the day. It conspicuously is not based upon any connected and critical interpretation of Scripture, and is as obviously opposed to its plain meaning, and the most clearly revealed doctrines. *It would be swept away by a deep conviction of the vileness and guilt of sin.* It is no less opposed, and that confessedly, to the consensus of the Creeds, Liturgies and Hymns of the whole historic Church of Christ."\* But the chief antidote to this movement—and this conviction ripens within me from day to day

\*"Still Hours," p. 123.

\*Presbyterian Review, Vol. VI, p. 377.



—is to be found in our Evangelical Lutheran Theology. It stands out in these modern times as the bulwark of the faith of God's Word,—the faith of old,—the faith of the Universal Church. Young Gentlemen, study that theology; dip deeply into it; fill your minds with its profound truth; imbibe its conservative spirit; encase yourselves in its evangelical armor, and you will not go forth to pliant alliance with loose rationalizing, destructive tendencies, but to do manly, Christian warfare for the truth of God, as it was, is now, and shall be—changeless evermore!

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE THERAPEUTÆ.

By REV. B. PICK, PH. D., Allegheny, Pa.

#### LITERATURE.

Philo's text is found in Mangey's edition, II, 471-486; in the Leipsic edition of 1828 (*Bibliotheca Sacra Patrum Ecclesiae Graecorum*) Vol. V, p. 304-323. The English translation of Yonge is found Vol. IV, 1-20 of the Works of Philo (Bohn's Library). A French translation of the treatise is published by Delaunay in his *Moines et Sibylles*, p. 89-112, Paris, 1874. Besides the works already mentioned, compare Gfrörer, *Philo und die jüdisch-alexandrinische Theosophie*, Stuttgart, 1835; Dähne, *Geschichtliche Darstellung der jüdisch-alexandrinischen Religions-Philosophie*, Halle, 1834; Ritschl, *die Entstehung der altkatholischen Kirche*, Bonn, 1857, p. 216; Baur, *Die Abhandlungen zur Geschichte der alten Philosophie*, Leipsic, 1876, p. 216; Schwegler, *das nachapostolische Zeitalter*, Tübingen, 1846, I, 190; Lutterbeck, *die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, Mayence, 1852, I, 131, 271; Clemens, *die Therapeuten*, Königsberg, 1869; Pick, Art. *Therapeutæ* in McClintock and Strong's Cyclop.; Lucius, *Die Therapeuten*, Strasburg, 1879; Ohle, *Die Essäer des Philo*, Leipsic, 1887; Ausfeld, *De libro περί τῶν πάντων σπουδαίων*, etc., Göttingen, 1887, and Harnack's review of the last two works in *Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1887, col. 493 seq.

A strange phenomenon in Jewish history are the Therapeutæ, or Jewish ascetics, whom the Jewish Alexandrian philosopher Philo has described in a separate treatise entitled "On a contemplative life or on the Virtue of Suppliants" or *De Vita Contemplativa*, and found in the second volume of Mangey's edition of Philo's works, pp. 471-486. It is noteworthy that no other writer of that period, not even Josephus, knows anything about the Therapeutæ; and when Christian writers since the time of Eusebius, *i. e.* since the beginning of the fourth century, speak of them, they only follow Philo's narrative, and the erroneous opinion of Eusebius (*Histor. Eccles.*, II. 17), who regarded the Therapeutæ as Christians, has been followed by all Church Fathers, with the exception of Photius.

Modern criticism has, with a few exceptions, identified the Egyptian Therapeutæ with the Palestinian Essenes, and on account of some similarities between them, has put up the view that Therapeutæ and Essenes starting from like principles only differed in that the former were only theorists, while the latter were more practical. Of late, however, the genuineness of Philo's treatise has been questioned by scholars like Grätz, Jost, Nicolas, Derenbourg, Kuenen, Renan, more especially by Lucius in his treatise *Die Therapeuten* (Strasburg, 1879), who regard Philo's treatise more or less as an embellishment of Christian monasticism as it began in Egypt, and especially the last named scholar comes to the conclusion that the Therapeutæ were not Jews, and that the treatise bearing the name of Philo was written towards the end of the 3d century as an apology for Christian asceticism.

Leaving aside for the present the question as to the genuineness or spuriousness, we will examine first what Philo has to say about the Therapeutæ.

#### I. MANNERS AND USAGES OF THE THERAPEUTÆ.

The fatherland of the Therapeutæ is Egypt, and beyond that country the order has probably not been propagated. When Philo speaks of their diffusion throughout the world, or to use his own words "now this class of persons may be met with in many places, for it was fitting that both Greece and the country

of the barbarians should partake of whatever is perfectly good," we must not take his words in their literal sense, as does Lucius, l. c., p. 16, but in a more general sense, because we have no notice whatever of the Therapeutæ outside of Egypt. What he meant to say is that, outside of Egypt, there were also men of a similar tendency, without believing that they really belonged to this order in Egypt. This is also the view of Schürer (*Theolog. Literaturzeitung*, 1880, col. 113). Keim thinks, therefore, that Philo's words are an exaggeration, or rather that he confuses the hermit life of the Jews with like "phenomena among the Greeks and barbarians." Grätz, however, holds a different opinion, and adduces this as an argument for Christian monks who were generally diffused at an early age (as early as the time of Eusebius or of Philo?). "But," asks Keim, "has not Philo compared both the Essenes and Therapeutæ with the Gymnosophists and Magi, with the wise man Kalanos, with Anaxagoras and Democritus? Josephus again with Daci and Polistes" (*Jesus of Nazara*, I, p. 377). It is certain that Philo in describing this order, had a certain colony in view near the lake Mareotis, to the south of Alexandria, where the Therapeutæ lived. Here they lived not too "near to one another as men do in cities, for immediate neighborhood to others would be a troublesome and unpleasant thing to men who have conceived an admiration for, and have determined to devote themselves to, solitude; and, on the other hand, they did not live very far from one another on account of the fellowship which they desire to cultivate, and because of the desirableness of being able to assist one another if they should be attacked by robbers." The houses of these men were very plain, just giving shelter in respect of the two things most important to be provided against, the heat of the summer and the cold from the open air. In each house there was a sacred shrine which was called the holy place, and the monastery in which they retired by themselves and performed all the mysteries of a holy life, bringing in nothing, neither meat, nor drink, nor anything else which is indispensable towards supplying the necessities of the body, but studying in that place the laws and the sacred oracles of God enunciated by the holy prophets, and hymns and psalms, and all kinds of other

things by reason of which knowledge and piety are increased and brought to perfection.

Simple as was their house, their raiment was equally so, being a cloak of some shaggy hide for winter, and a thin mantle or linen shawl in summer; and in their religious assemblies they appeared in a white garment.

As continence was regarded as the highest virtue, their mode of living was very simple. None of them took any meal or drink before the setting of the sun, because they believed that the work of philosophizing was one worthy of the light, and that the care for the necessities of the body was suitable only to darkness, on which account they appropriated the day to the one occupation, and a brief portion of the night to the other. They ate just enough as not to be hungry, and drank just enough to escape from thirst, avoiding all satiety, as an enemy of and a plotter against both soul and body. They ate nothing of a costly character, but plain bread and a seasoning of salt, which the more luxurious of them further seasoned with hyssop, and their drink was water from the spring. Many also, Philo tells us, could fast for three days, several for six. For such a simple mode of living they naturally had no need of great earthly possessions; but as Philo says, they left their possessions to their relatives or friends, and without any property they went out, as if their mortal life had already come to an end, only anxious for an immortal and blessed existence.

As it was the endeavor of the Therapeutæ to attain the highest possible blessedness, their whole life was devoted to those things which led to that end and consisted in the study of the Holy writings and in religious exercises and contemplations.

They prayed twice every day, at morning and at evening. When the sun rose, they entreated God "that the happiness of the coming day may be real happiness, so that their minds may be filled with heavenly light, and when the sun was setting they prayed that their soul, being entirely lightened and relieved of the burden of the outward senses, and of the appropriate object of these outward senses, may be able to trace out truth existing in its own consistory and council chamber. And the interval between morning and evening was by them wholly devoted to

meditation on and to practice of virtue. To this end they took up the sacred scriptures and philosophized concerning them, investigating the allegories of their national philosophy, since they looked upon their literal expressions as symbols of some secret meaning of nature, intended to be conveyed in those figurative expressions."

As a canon of such allegorical exposition of Scripture the real home of which was in Egypt, they used the writings left by the founders of their sect. They also composed "psalms and hymns to God in every kind of metre and melody imaginable, which they of necessity arrange in more dignified rhythm. Therefore during six days, each of these individuals, retiring into solitude by himself, philosophizes by himself in one of the places called monasteries, never going outside the threshold of the outer court, and indeed never even looking out." And adds Philo, "they always retain an imperishable recollection of God, so that not even in their dreams is any other object ever presented to their eyes except the beauty of the divine virtues and of the divine powers. Therefore many persons speak in their sleep, divulging and publishing the celebrated doctrines of the sacred philosophy."

Women were also received into their order, the greater part of whom, though old, were virgins in respect to their purity, and were animated by the same admiration for, and love of, wisdom in the exercise of which they were desirous to pass their lives. These women like the male members of the order lived separately, performing the same duties; but at the meetings and banquets both sexes were united.

They did not use the ministrations of slaves, looking upon the possession of servants or slaves to be a thing absolutely and wholly contrary to nature, for nature has created all men free; but the injustice and covetousness of some men who prefer inequality, that cause of all evil, having subdued some, has given to the more powerful authority over those who are weaker. Accordingly at their common banquets, no slaves, but free men ministered to the guests, performing the offices of servants, not under compulsion, nor in obedience to any imperious com-

mands, but of their own voluntary free will, with all eagerness and promptitude anticipating all orders, for they are not any chance free men who are appointed to perform these duties, but young men who are selected from their order with all possible care on account of their excellence. Their dress was such that nothing of a slavish character could be seen in it; they come in, says Philo, to perform their service ungirdled, and with their tunics let down, in order that nothing which bears any resemblance to a slavish appearance may be introduced into this festival. For these young men, as Philo observes, eager to attain to the perfection of virtue, with affectionate rivalry ministered to their fathers and mothers, thinking their common parents more closely connected with them than those who were related by blood.

At the banquet they were presided over by a president, who addressed them and intoned a hymn, in which all joined. They sat according to their age, *i. e.* according to the length of time they belonged to the order. We must not, however, think that the president or elders exercised any gubernatorial power, for this is nowhere inferred; their functions were only restricted to the assemblies, in which also others acted as leaders of the choruses, such were the *hegemon* and *exarchos*.

The seventh day was especially distinguished. They anointed their bodies, and, clothed in white garments, they assembled in the common *semnecion*. Here they sat down with all becoming gravity according to their ages, keeping their hands inside their garments, having their right hand between their chest and their dress, and the left hand down by their side, close to their flank. Then the oldest of them, who had the most profound learning in their doctrines came forward and spoke with steadfast look and with steadfast voice, with great power of reasoning, and great prudence, not making an exhibition of his oratorical powers like the rhetoricians of old, or the sophists of the present day, but investigating with great pains and explaining with minute accuracy the precise meaning of the laws, which sits, not indeed, at the tips of their ears, but penetrates through their hearing into the soul, and remains their lastingly; and all the rest listen in silence to the praises which he bestows

upon the law, showing their assent only by nods of the head or the eager look of the eyes. In this sacred assembly the women also shared, having the same feelings of admiration as the men, and having adopted the same sect with equal deliberation and decision. But they had their own seats, being separated from the male members by a wall rising three or four cubits upwards from the ground, but in such a manner that they could hear the voice of the speaker.

The seventh Sabbath was especially distinguished. The number fifty was regarded by them as the most holy and natural of numbers, being compounded of the power of the right-angled triangle, which is the principle of the origination and condition of the whole. Clothed in white garments, they came together to the common feast. Before they partook of the same, they lifted up their eyes and hands to heaven and prayed to God that it might be acceptable to him. After the prayer, they sat down, the men sitting on the right hand and the women apart from them on the left, on rugs of the coarsest materials, cheap mats of the most ordinary kind of the papyrus of the land, piled upon the ground and projecting a little near the elbow, so that the feasters may lean upon them. Before the feast commenced, questions were asked and answered. A passage of the Scripture was explained and religious questions were settled. All listened attentively to the speaker, indicating their attention and comprehension by their nods and looks, and the praise which they were inclined to bestow on the speaker, by the cheerfulness and gentle manner in which they followed him with their eyes and with the fore-finger of the right hand. When the president appeared to have spoken at sufficient length, and to have carried out his intentions adequately, so that his explanation has gone on felicitously and fluently through his own acuteness, and the hearing of the others had been profitable, applause arose from them all as of men rejoicing together at what they had seen and heard; and then some one rising up, sang a hymn which had been made in honor of God, either such as he had composed himself, or some ancient one of some old poet. After him others also arose in their ranks, in becoming order, while every one else listened in decent silence, except when it was proper to



take up the burden of the song, and to join in at the end. And when each had finished his psalm, then the young men brought in the table on which was placed that most holy food, the leavened bread, with a seasoning of salt, with which hyssop was mingled out of reverence for the sacred table, which was in the holy outer temple; for on this table were placed loaves and salt without seasoning, and the bread was unleavened, and the salt unmixed with anything else.

After the feast they celebrated the sacred festival during the whole night; and this nocturnal festival was celebrated in the following manner: All stood up together, and in the middle of the entertainment two choruses were formed at first, the one of men, and the other of women, and for each chorus there was a leader and chief selected, who was the most honorable and most excellent of the band. Then they sang hymns which had been composed in honor of God in many metres and tunes, at one time all singing together, and at another moving their hands and dancing in corresponding harmony, and uttering in an inspired manner songs of thanksgiving, and at another time regular odes, and performing all necessary strophes and antistrophes. Then when each chorus of the men and each chorus of the women had feasted separately by itself, they joined together, and the two became one chorus, an imitation of that one which, in old time, was established by the Red Sea, on account of the wondrous works which were displayed there before Israel, and where both men and women together, under the influence of divine inspiration, becoming all one chorus, sang hymns of thanksgiving to God the Saviour, Moses the prophet leading the men, and Miriam the prophetess leading the women. When the sun arose, they raised their hands to heaven, imploring tranquillity and truth, and acuteness of understanding. After the prayer each retired to his own separate abode, with the intention of again practicing the usual philosophy to which each had been wont to devote himself. Such then is the description of the Therapeutæ, as given by Philo, whose very words we have followed.



## II. THERAPEUTÆ AND ESSENES.

On account of the manifold similar traits which were found among the Therapeutæ and Essenes, it has been inferred that the Therapeutæ were but the Egyptian branch of Palestinian Essenism. This hypothesis is seemingly confirmed by what Philo says at the beginning of his treatise on the Therapeutæ: "Having mentioned the Essenes, who in all respects selected for their admiration and for their especial adoption the practical course of life, and who excel in all, or what perhaps may be a less unpopular and invidious thing to say, in most of its parts, I will now proceed, in the regular order of my subject, to speak of those who have embraced the speculative life, and I will say what appears to me to be desirable to be said on the subject."

The majority of critics have therefore not hesitated to believe in a causative connection between the two sects, and have thus, on account of Philo's words, separated the Egyptian Therapeutæ, as the theorists, from the Palestinian Essenes, whom they designated the practitioners. In this assumption, there can only be a diversity of opinion as to which of the two sects justly claims the temporal precedence—whether the theory of the Therapeutæ or the practice of the Essenes is the original, or, in other words, whether Egypt or Palestine is the fatherland of that tendency within Judaism which is designated by the name of Essenism. The opinion that the temporal precedence belongs to the Therapeutæ, and that after Therapeutism had been planted on the soil of Judæa the order of the Essenes originated, is advocated by *Gfrörer* (*Kritische Geschichte des Urchristenthums*, Stuttgart, 1831, part II, p. 335 seq.), *Lutterbeck* (*die neutestamentlichen Lehrbegriffe*, Mayence, 1852, Vol. I, p. 275 seq.), *Mangold* (*die Irrlehrer der Pastoralbriefe*, Marburg, 1856, p. 57 seq.), and *Holtzmann* (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel und der Entstehung der Christenthums*, Leipsic, 1867, Vol. II, p. 79 seq.) The opposite opinion is represented by *Ritschl* (*Theolog. Jahrbücher*, ed. Baur und Zeller, 1855, p. 343 seq.), *Hilgenfeld* (*die jüdische Apokalyptik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, Jena, 1857, p. 278 seq.), *Herzfeld* (*Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, 2d ed., Leipsic, 1863, Vol. III, p. 406)—these three asserting that the Egyptian type was an exaggerated, forced and unsound de-

velopment of the sect, as it appeared in Palestine,—*Zeller* (*Geschichte der Philosophie der Griechen*, III, ii, 288 seq., Leipsic, 1868); *Bellermann* (*Nachrichten aus dem Alterthum über Essener und Therapeuten*, Berlin, 1821, p. 80, note), and *Harnischmacher* (*de Essenorum apud Judæos societate*, Bonn, 1866, p. 26) admit a causative connection of both, without deciding the time of the origin. *Keim* who seems to favor the views of *Ritschl*, *Hilgenfeld* and *Herzfeld*, says "it is evident that the exaggerated form must have resulted from that which was moderate rather than that the case was reversed. The course taken by Essenism itself, from the towns to the villages, and then into the deserts, will moreover serve to mark the time in which the Egyptian hermits had their origin" (*Jesus of Nazara*, Vol. I, p. 377).

In opposition to the above named critics we deny any connection between these two sects—and herein *Lucius* (l. c. p. 45 seq.) agrees with us—and dismiss the question altogether which of the two formed the connecting link for the other. In order to justify our assertion we will draw a parallel between the two sects, and first consider those points in which both agree.

#### A. POINTS OF AGREEMENT.

1. Both sects diligently studied the Scripture, and interpreted the same allegorically.
2. Besides the Old Testament, both had a high regard for the writings of the older members of their order.
3. Both abhorred slavery.
4. Both lived in a very simple manner, and were accustomed to appear at their religious exercises in white garments.

More common traits cannot be proved, excepting, perhaps, the fact that both led an unmarried life. But even this is no proof, because, according to *Josephus*, at least one part of the Essenes, though perhaps only the minority, married. It cannot also be said that both agreed in leading a life entirely separated from the world. Of the Therapeutæ, it is true, this can be said, but not of the Essenes, because, as *Josephus* tells us, they instructed the youth and took otherwise an active part in the weal

and woe of their people, as they did, for instance, in the war against the Romans for the liberty of their country.

B. POINTS OF DIFFERENCES.

1. The Therapeutæ led a monastic, secluded life, given entirely to contemplation. The Essenes, according to the rules of their order, were obliged to work. Their labor was prescribed and regulated by officers purposely appointed. They cultivated the fields, and were engaged in manual labors as well as in arts.

2. The Therapeutæ lived separated from each other in cells, and only came together on the Sabbath and on special occasions. The Essenes, however, wherever they resided, had their common lodges, where they lived and dined together.

3. The Therapeutæ anointed their bodies; the Essenes abstained from anointing.

4. The Therapeutæ, upon entering the order, left everything to their relatives and friends. The Essenes delivered their property to the order for the benefit of all.

5. The Therapeutæ did not eat before the setting of the sun; the Essenes enjoyed two meals daily.

6. The Essenes were divided into different classes, which were so marked that a member of the upper class had to bathe himself when he touched anything belonging to a lower class. The Therapeutæ had no such distinctions.

7. Of the Essenes we are told that the members of the higher degrees had the knowledge of mysteries, which was not communicated to the lower degrees; of the Therapeutæ we know nothing of the kind.

8. Each Essene had to bathe himself daily; such lustrations were not in use among the Therapeutæ.

9. The Therapeutæ revered the temple at Jerusalem and the Levitical priesthood, and were not so far apart from orthodox Judaism. The Essenes, on the contrary, believed their lustrations and their mode of living to be of greater importance than the ordinances prescribed to the priests for the service of the Temple. They furnished no offerings to the Temple at Jerusalem, and thus became guilty of apostatizing from an important part of the Mosaic law.

10. The Essenes were especially addicted to medicine and prophecy; we know nothing of these practices among the Therapeutæ.

It is obvious that the differences between the two sects cannot consist in that the one was given to theory and the other to practice, because the supposition of a like ground-principle is not sufficient for explaining so many, and at the same time very important differences. After all that we know of both these sects, the supposition of a casual connection between the two must appear very hazardous; for if there really were such a connection between them, and if both were essentially one and the same sect, it is surprising that Josephus has not recorded the fact. As little as we believe with Philo in a real connection between the Jewish Essenes, the seven wise men of Greece, and the Indian Gymnosophists, whom he compares in his book *Quod omnisprobus liber*, just as little connection is there between the Essenes and Therapeutæ, because Philo divided them into the theorists and practitioners. The Essenes did not originate from the propagation of Therapeutism in Palestine, because, as we know, Alexandrian religious philosophy did not find a fertile soil in Judæa, especially at the time in which both these sects originated. We cannot assume that the reverse should have taken place, otherwise the essential traits of Essenism would have been found again among the Therapeutæ. The stamp of both sects is so different that they cannot be identical; and in treating of the Therapeutæ no regard is therefore to be paid to the Essenes.

### III. THERAPEUTÆ AND CHRISTIANITY.

Assuming that the Essenes were only consistent Chasidim has led the Jewish historian Graetz to make the assertion that Philo's treatise on the Therapeutæ according to which they were hitherto regarded as an Egyptian offshoot of Palestine Essenism, could not be genuine. According to the same writer, it is not so much owing to the description of the Essenes by Josephus as to the book on *the Contemplative Life* that those not coinciding with the former's views have arrived at a false result regarding the essence and origin of the Essene sect. According

to Graetz the sect of the Therapeutæ never existed; they were Christians, ascetics of a heretic tendency, who sprang up by the dozen in the 2d and 3d centuries. The author of this book which has caused so much confusion is not Philo but a Christian "who probably belonged either to the Encratico-gnostic or Montanistic party, and intended to write a panegyric on monasticism, the high antiquity of which Philo's authority was to confirm."

This is the result at which Graetz arrives, and although he takes it for granted that the attentive reader of the book on the *Contemplative Life* must at once adopt the correctness of his assertion, he has nevertheless taken the pains to make good his hypothesis at great length.

This hypothesis of Graetz has been analyzed by Zeller (in his history of the philosophy of the Greeks) and the result is that the reasons adduced by Graetz are not sufficient and acceptable at all. In resuming the question once more, and examining the argument of Graetz in order to establish the Christian character of the Therapeutæ, we do so because of its close connection with the essence and origin of the sect—in this we differ with Zeller—and because there are some points to be proved against Graetz. The latter has denied the existence of a Jewish sect of the Therapeutæ, and consequently also the genuineness of Philo's treatise, on the ground of the silence of Pliny and Josephus, who wrote so much about the Essenes; while they know nothing of the Therapeutæ, the alleged Egyptian branch of this sect. Against this, Zeller has argued that the silence of Josephus cannot be so remarkable—an argument used also by Schürer (l. c. col. 113) against Lucius, and by Delaunay (*Moines et Sibylles*, Paris, 1874, p. 41) against Graetz, who says that one might just as well deny the existence of the Essenes from the silence of the Talmud—since the Therapeutæ were a branch of the Essenes restricted to Egypt alone, and because Josephus tells very little about the later affairs of the Jews in that country. Schürer alleges that Josephus in describing the main tendencies of Palestinian Judaism, he had no occasion to speak of the Therapeutæ and that this fact answers for the silence of

those writers who otherwise followed him. Delaunay explains the silence of Josephus because of the "*dedain des Juifs palestiniens pour la science des Juifs hellénistes.*" But if the Therapeutæ were really an Egyptian branch of the Palestinian Essenes, or had some connection with them, the Essenes in Palestine ought to have known something about it; and even if Pliny's silence could be explained because he only knows *one* Essenic colony living by the Dead Sea, it might be supposed—and in this Graetz is correct—that Josephus, who otherwise speaks very fully about the order, ought to have mentioned the Therapeutæ. The silence of Josephus can therefore only be explained from the very fact—not as Delaunay is inclined to admit from the fact that Josephus has confounded both sects—that the Therapeutæ had no connection whatever with the Essenes, but that they formed an independent sect within Egyptian Judaism, the existence of which—since its number and activity were less important—was entirely unknown to Josephus. Graetz also finds incredible what Philo says about the female Therapeutæ, because Josephus marks it as one of the characteristics of the Essenes to avoid all contact with the opposite sex; hence he believes that these female Therapeutæ were nothing else than sisters (*sorores introductæ*), whom the Christian ascetics used to have about them for the sake of attaining, by constant temptation, a higher virtue, but who, as is known, have been the cause of great scandals. Against this Zeller remarks that in this respect the Egyptian Essenes or Therapeutæ might have had other institutions than those of the Palestinians, since their principles on the worth of an unmarried state were in the main not affected; and this difference of view does not indicate such a great deviation from the principles of the order as the practice of one branch of the Palestinian Essenes who married. We agree with Graetz that, according to Josephus, the wives of the married Essenes were not, like the female Therapeutæ, members of the order. But this actual deviation—that while the Essenes excluded women entirely from the common feasts and meetings, this was not the case among the Therapeutæ—is only another proof that Essenes and Therapeutæ are two different sects. This being the case, it must not be supposed, as Graetz believes, that

the Therapeutæ, not being Essenes, were *Christians*. Graetz's hypothesis of making the female Therapeutæ *sorores subintroductæ* is more ingenious than true. We admit that these sisters lived in very communication with the Christian ascetics, but who can infer from the participation of women in the common feasts and meetings, that the Therapeutæ really lived each with a female companion? From what has been said above, we know that all members were left to themselves in order not to be disturbed in their contemplative life, and besides where in the passage in Philo from which Graetz can prove that the Therapeutæ, like the Christian ascetics, had aimed at a higher degree of perfection by living together with the female members?

Another point which according to Graetz proves the spuriousness of Philo's treatise, is to be found in the fact that from the introductory words, it connects itself with the treatise *Quod omnis probus liber, i. e.* that every man who is virtuous is also free, erroneously, as with a writing on the Essenes. The words in question are: "having mentioned the Essenes, who in all respects selected for their admiration and for their especial adoption," etc. Graetz thinks that Philo could not possibly say that he "wrote a treatise" on the Essenes (*essaion peri dialechteis*), when the passage in question only occupies the twelfth part of the treatise; and he only mentions this sect as one of the many. But against this it must be argued that *dialogestai peri tinous* does not mean "to write a treatise," but to "speak on something," or as Delaunay says (l. c. p. 43): "qui peut faire allusion au passage," and this, as Zeller remarks, Philo has evidently done concerning the Essenes. Moreover, such an association of topics is not comical at all, as Graetz thinks, because by this two Jewish sects which have at least some traits in common were brought into connection.

But the main point for the spuriousness of the treatise on the Therapeutæ and for its being written by a Christian, Graetz thinks to lie in the fact that Christian writers as Eusebius and others after him, have recognized the Therapeutæ as "flesh of their own flesh."

The holy cells of the Therapeutæ are called monasteries. It is evident, argues the Jewish historian, that we have here the



beginning of the monastic cells, which existed even before Anthony of Thebes, the founder of monasticism. But even if we admit that the entire mode of living of the Therapeutæ is similar to that of the later Christian monks, it by no means follows that the Therapeutæ were *Christian monks*. Why—and herein we agree with Graetz—should there not have been in Egypt, the fatherland and the proper home of monasticism, ascetics even before Anthony of Thebes? And why should this not have been possible within the pale of Judaism? And are the Palestinian Essenes not a similar phenomenon? To impress on the Therapeutæ the Christian character because of the word *monasterion*, which the Christian monks used for their cell, is not reasonable, because, as Zeller reminds, the expression *monasterion* and *semneion* were only used by the Therapeutæ for a part, and not, as did the Christian monks, for the whole, of the dwelling. The supposition seems to be that the Therapeutæ, or rather Philo himself formed the words *monasterion* and *semneion*, and that Christian monks borrowed this nomenclature from their predecessors. But argues Graetz, the Therapeutæ had not only a common feast, but after the feast they had a kind of Lord's Supper, consisting of unleavened bread, of which only the better ones partook. Graetz evidently believes that we have here the difference between the *missa fidelium* and *missa catechumenorum*, from the former of which, consisting in the celebration of the Lord's Supper, and in a kind of liturgy, those who were not yet baptized, together with those who were excommunicated, were excluded, for, he asks, is this not Christian?

To this we answer "no." Graetz, as Zeller remarks, has overlooked the fact that the so-called Lord's Supper did not take place after the common meal, but it was this common meal itself. At this meal not *unleavened*, but *leavened* bread was eaten, out of reverence for the unleavened showbread in the Temple at Jerusalem. But above all Graetz is wrong in his assertion that this supper was a prerogative of the better ones. Now the words *kreittones*, i. e. the better ones, do not refer to the Therapeutæ, but to the Jewish priest, to whom alone the Therapeutæ conceded the use of unleavened bread as a special prerogative. This unquestionably follows from Philo's words, "and when each

individual has finished his psalm, then the young men bring in the table on which was placed that most holy food, the leavened bread, with a seasoning of salt, with which hyssop is mingled, out of reverence for the sacred table, which lies thus in the holy outer temple; for on this table are placed two loaves and salt without seasoning, and the bread is unleavened, and the salt unmixed with anything else, for it was becoming that the simplest and purest things should be allotted to the most excellent portion of the priests, as a reward for their ministrations, and that the others should admire similar things, but should abstain from the loaves, in order that those who are the more excellent persons should have the precedence."

Another proof for the Christian character of the Therapeutæ, Graetz sees in the fact that the presbyters among them occupied the first positions and not because of their age but because of their strict observance of the Therapeutic life. Thus, argues Graetz, we see here the presbyters or *episcopoi* of the Christian congregations, who held one and the same office in the ante-Nicene period. But he forgets that the office of presbyters in the Church was not a new institution, but derived from the synagogue. The same we find among the Essenes also, yet on this cause Graetz will not assert that the Essenes were no Jews, but Christians, although he firmly believes that Christ proceeded from the Essene order.

Without arguing other points adduced by Graetz to prove the Christian character of the Therapeutæ, we will dwell only on his referring to Eusebius and those who followed him. Eusebius, he says, regarded the Therapeutæ as Christians; but this proves the least. Eusebius regards the treatise on the "Contemplative Life" as Philonian and makes the Jewish philosopher a disciple of John Mark, who accompanied the apostle Paul on his first missionary tour, and afterwards labored at Alexandria. According to Eusebius, the Therapeutæ already existed as Christians in the first century of our era, and can therefore not be adduced by Graetz in support of his theory that the Therapeutæ were a Christian monastic sect of the 2d or 3d century of our era, and with the exception of Graetz no writer has regarded the Therapeutæ as a heretical sect, and he himself is yet unde-

cided in what series of heretical sects, which sprang up by the dozen within the Church in the 2d and 3d centuries, he should place them. According to Graetz, the author of the treatise *probably* belonged to the Encratite-gnostic or Montanistic party, but he has given no reason for this his assertion. But we ask what reason could there be for a Christian, even for a heretic, to father upon Philo such a book, for the sake of recommending monastic asceticism? Throughout the entire treatise not once the name of Christ nor any of the doctrines peculiar to Christianity is mentioned, and yet the Therapeutæ should have been Christians? The linguistic character of the treatise is entirely Philonian and there is no internal nor external argument for denying Philo to be the author of the treatise. The Therapeutæ were Jews, such is also the opinion of Schaff, who in a note states that Eusebius "takes them erroneously for Christians" (History of Chr. Church, III, 152).

#### IV. CHARACTER AND ORIGIN OF THE SECT OF THE THERAPEUTÆ.

From the manner in which Philo speaks of the Therapeutæ, there can be no doubt that he himself was very much prepossessed regarding them, and his treatise is nothing but a panegyric on the sect. This fact alone would lead to the supposition—which, indeed, is also supposed by the whole character of the sect—that the Therapeutæ cultivated and adhered to Jewish religious philosophy, which numbered Philo among its most zealous disciples. It is hardly conceivable, as Gfrörer (*Philo und die Alexandrinische Theosophie*, II, 281 seq.) has indicated, that in a time like that in which Philo wrote, when the religious movement was at a high pitch, and when the most diverse religious parties existed side by side, a man with such peculiar religious views should write such a panegyric on a sect unless it represented his own views. What Philo writes is not mere fiction, but as he says in the beginning of his treatise that in his narrative he strictly adheres to the truth, and on this account he is to be believed.

That the Therapeutæ represented a Jewish sect, is doubtless. The writings of the Old Testament formed the basis of their investigations and researches. In their *semneia* they had only the

law and the prophets. Philo calls them "the disciples of Moses," and further says, "that they devoted their whole life and themselves to the knowledge and contemplation of the affairs of nature in accordance with the most sacred admonitions and precepts of the prophet Moses." Besides their strict observance of the Jewish Sabbath, the Therapeutæ had great reverence for the Temple at Jerusalem and the Levitical priesthood. Their holy choruses are expressly said to be an imitation of those at the Red Sea. All these traits show them to be on the one hand strict adherents to the traditions and views of Judaism, while the deviations in many particulars on the other hand stamp them as a sect.

As to their name, Philo leaves us to choose between two meanings, either to call them "physicians of the soul," or "servants of God." The latter is probably the more correct, since it accords more fully with the whole tenor and character of the sect. Leading a contemplative life, the Therapeutæ worshiped God in the sense of Alexandrian theosophy, in opposition to the faith and worship of God of the great mass. And this shows that there existed a spiritual relationship between them and Jewish Alexandrian religious philosophy. The purpose of their contemplative life was to lead to the knowledge of the Deity. To achieve this it became necessary to suppress the material man and elevate the spiritual. For this reason they lived in a very simple manner, restricting their wants to the smallest measure. Continence and moderation they regarded as the foundation of all virtues, because by these man is brought nearer to the simple, which enables him to see the simple essence of the Deity and to indulge in the blessed intention of the same. On this account the Therapeutæ lived secluded from the outside world; they denied themselves everything that could bring them in contact with others, thus living only to themselves and their contemplation. They denied themselves marriage, because they preferred to live together with the divine wisdom; and sought not after the mortal, but the immortal fruits of a soul loved by God, and which the same only brings forth when she is impregnated by the spiritual rays of the heavenly Father. For this reason slavery too was banished from their midst, be-

cause in a community which was animated by such motives, the presence of men could not be tolerated who were degraded below the dignity of men.

But the relationship between the Therapeutæ and the Alexandrian religious philosophy shows itself more fully in the allegorical exegesis, which, distinguishing between spirit and letter, idea and symbol, endeavored to explain the writings of the Old Testament. According to Philo's testimony, the Therapeutæ possessed the writings of the ancients, who, as the heads of this tendency, left behind them many memorials of such an allegorical system. The same symbolic character we also find in their holy feasts, which in their historical connection were to remind of the exode from Egypt and the passing through the Red Sea, imitating at the same time the singing of Moses and Miriam on that occasion. Now according to the allegorical exposition of the Alexandrians and Philo Egypt is the symbol of the sensual life in earthly lust and bodily pleasure, and the song of Moses symbolizes the rapture which man feels when after denying himself every earthly thing and suppressing all sensual lust, as a purely spiritual being revels in the intuition of the Deity. Thus the Therapeutæ, like Philo and the Alexandrians, held the same view that the body is the seat of sin and that the flight from a corporeal into a purely spiritual existence ought to be the true and highest aim of life. And Philo expressly states that the Therapeutæ of their anxious desire for an immortal and blessed existence, thinking that their mortal life had already come to an end, left their possessions behind and retired into the solitude.

We have thus in the Therapeutæ a sect which earnestly strove after carrying out and realizing those principles and views, to which the Jewish Alexandrian religious philosophy did homage. At what time, however, this sect, with its fixed ceremonies, originated is hard to tell, as Philo does not say anything more definite about it. From the indication of Philo that the Therapeutæ possessed writings of the ancients which the founders had left behind them as memorials of the allegorical system, and which the Therapeutæ took as a kind of model, we may infer that the sect existed long before Philo. When it originated can merely

be conjectured, perhaps and probably at the beginning of the 2d century before Christ.

That the sect of the Therapeutæ was propagated beyond Egypt is not probable, and its number was, probably also, not very large. At any rate it is very interesting to know that about the time when Christ came into the world, the desire was felt in Egyptian Judaism also, to come into a nearer relation to the Deity and to be free from the existing but unsatisfactory relation. The Therapeutæ tried to reach this goal by renouncing all earthly things, and on this account they resemble the Christian monks, who may have borrowed many traits from them, since Egypt was the real fatherland of monasticism. When, however, Christians regarded them for a long time as their equals, they were mistaken because the history of the Therapeutæ plainly shows how far they were still from that goal which alone can satisfy the heart, but which human reason and power alone cannot reach.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### EMPTY PEWS—HOW SHALL WE FILL THEM?

##### SUGGESTIONS FROM A LAYMAN.

By G. D. STAHLEY, A. M., M., D., Easton, Pa.

This question is a difficult one and cannot be readily answered. Theoretically it has been frequently answered, but practically and experimentally the details of a successful solution are yet to be demonstrated. Nor is it my purpose to attempt an impossible task, or to stultify myself in an endeavor to give a categorical answer to a question which has puzzled wiser heads than mine.

The thoughts I shall here express are simply intended as elementary suggestions, in the study of this subject, and are offered in a kindly spirit, subject to revision if not found tenable. With the space at command it will only be possible to touch on a few points, and these drawn from only a limited division of

the subject. As a layman, I shall treat the question from a layman's standpoint, and as from the location of the pew the principal object in range is the pulpit, I shall direct my gaze and my remarks toward that quarter.

We miserable sinners in the pew get belabored quite frequently as to what our duties are, and as "turn about is fair play," and as the "golden rule" is of universal application, I think it is only fair that now and then the camera should be turned in the opposite direction. But I wish it to be distinctly understood, that whatever may be my criticisms or strictures on the pulpit, in the consideration of this question, I offer them in a kindly, Christian spirit.

It seems to me that the persons, whose church attendance we should first seek to improve, are the church members themselves. It is vital that these should feel their obligations in this direction. I do not believe that a military officer, in company with his drum major, and a few pieces of music, can do much service on the field. His willing and well trained soldiers must be close at his side. The regular attendance and co-operation of the membership must be secured.

Attracting large miscellaneous audiences by so-called "personal magnetism," and clap-trap oratory, or mountebank methods, does not win souls for Christs, and does not extend the boundaries of the "Church visible." Christianity recruits its ranks from the army of sinners, and the latter must therefore be brought within the hearing of the preached word, and it is their attendance at church that we greatly desire. But unless we have an attentive, a consecrated, and a co-operative church membership, we are powerless to influence these people. Instead, therefore, of considering that very interesting question, "How can we best get the masses to attend church?" I will only consider that more restricted, more primary and more vital point, "How can we secure a better attendance on the part of church members?"

This question may be answered comprehensively by saying—secure their attendance by securing their interest. He who does not have the interest of his auditors, speaks in vain, and a minister who does not arouse his people's interest, must necessarily



do the opposite,—develop their indifference, foster their inattention, and finally have the mortification of preaching to sealed ears or vacant pews. To interest does not mean to entertain. "Smartness," so called, is nowhere so out of place as in the pulpit. Elocutionary eccentricities, theatrical postures, gymnastic contortions, the odd, the ludicrous, the sensational, all these things, "though it make the unskillful laugh, cannot but make the judicious grieve."

This spirit of interest, which I consider so essential, centers, to a very important degree, in the minister himself. He must develop an attractive individuality. He should at least use all diligence not to make himself repulsive. Passivity will not answer, for a passive man is an aggravation, and soon becomes intolerable. Unless I have confidence in, or respect and admiration for the messenger, the message he brings to me must necessarily only secure my indifferent attention. If he is of like nature as myself, not only anatomically and physiologically, but by the affinities of a common humanity, through which he strives to influence me, then do I readily become responsive. But if he is ignorant of, or purposely ignores my human nature, and insists in approaching me only in his ecclesiastical capacity, taking special care to inform me that he is one of the Lord's anointed, and that it is my unquestionable duty to listen and obey, or be forever lost, then, because of a consequent repugnance for the man himself, I also develop an aversion towards the Gospel he preaches.

If I had the pecuniary means I would establish an additional professorship in our Theological Seminary, and this professorship should be devoted to careful and thorough instruction in the principles of the theory and practice of common sense and of human nature. The problem of "how best to handle a man," which must be so thoroughly understood by those who would succeed in secular business, should be even more thoroughly comprehended by those who are engaged in that consecrated pursuit of winning treasures for Christ. True the woods are full of crooked sticks, which cannot be made to serve any useful purpose, but very much valuable timber is allowed to go to waste for want of a proper hewer and artificer. The Lord made

us with certain endowments, proclivities and frailties, and these human conditions need to be closely studied. The minister who is the least capable of doing this, is generally the first to open a tirade against what he calls the captiousness and antagonism of his people.

We laymen often get the name of being "stiff-necked and perverse," but this misnomer arises from the fact that we simply insist that we shall be dealt with on a common-sense basis, and whenever the minister approaches us on the principle of "come let us reason together," it is very seldom indeed that any trouble ensues. To be as "wise as serpents and as harmless as doves," is simply following out our Lord's teachings. Tact, judgement, hard common sense, are the weapons to conquer human nature with, and the fact that the preacher's message is of super-human origin, does not excuse him from neglecting human means and methods in the execution of his work.

Among these means the personal quality of sociability is important. Now in order to be sociable, a man need not grin, and giggle, and be silly. This is a sure way to make himself an intolerable nuisance. His remarks need not be frivolous or always common-place. This will only add to his offensiveness. There is such a thing as respectful sociability, good fellowship, nature touching nature in genial response. These qualities are hard to define, and harder still to acquire, *de novo*, and it is not my purpose to speak of them at length, but their importance cannot be overestimated, and if a minister cannot succeed in acquiring or developing this personal element of attraction, he fails in a most vital point. It may be an inexcusable weakness on our part, but we laymen, although we love the Gospel supremely, yet we are also very anxious to be able to love the man who preaches it to us, and if the latter by his manner and personal qualities, becomes obnoxious to us, we frequently exercise our free agency by remaining away from the sanctuary altogether.

Besides this desire of the laity to be socially attached to their pastor, it is also necessary that they should be able to respect and reverence him as the incumbent of a high office, the commissioned representative of God himself. Laymen enjoy good preaching, but no less do they also admire, and, by the peculiar

necessities of the case, *demand* good practicing from the preacher. Indeed they are quite unable to maintain a proper feeling of respect or reverence for the ministry, unless the ministry itself sets the example of religious compliance with its own precepts. The apostle Paul, in writing to his "fellow laborers," recognized this truth, when he said: "Giving no offense in anything that the ministry be not blamed, but in all things approving ourselves as the ministers of God in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, \* \* \* by pureness, by longsuffering, by kindness, by the word of truth, by the power of God, by honor and dishonor, by evil report and good report." It sometimes occurs that a church member goes to his preacher and says: "How often shall my brother sin against me and I forgive him, till seven times? Promptly, and with the dignity of an oracle he replies, "not until seven times, but until seventy times seven," and he further commends him to the example of Christ, who, "when he was reviled, reviled not again; when he suffered, he threatened not, but committed himself to him who judgeth righteously." Whilst the member is contemplating this personal and scriptural advice, and is perhaps preparing to act upon it, it may be that the minister himself is made the subject of adverse criticism. Now we naturally expect, that living under the same gospel, we should be guided and controlled by the same divine precepts, and that he who declares the law, should himself be willing to abide by it. It is therefore, a matter of great surprise, and of disgust even, for church members to observe that under the stress of criticism, the preacher will occasionally set aside pious precepts and scriptural injunctions, and defend himself with real carnal weapons of choicest selection. Such ministers are properly classified with those Jewish interpreters of the law, of whom Christ said: "They bind heavy burdens and grievous to be borne, and lay them on men's shoulders; but they themselves will not move them with one of their fingers." A few such specimens do the general ministry a very great deal of harm. Such conduct destroys that respect for the ministerial office which is so necessary to secure the interest of the people and their attendance at church. It is my privilege and pleasure to be personally ac-

quainted with a great many of our General Synod Lutheran ministers, and I am happy to say, that as a class, I regard them with great respect and admiration. They are intelligently, religiously, and consistently devoted to the preaching and practicing of their high calling. But, as in other callings, exceptions do exist, and these few do great harm in subverting the power of the gospel, by poisoning the minds of the people against the sincerity of the ministry, and by thus keeping them away from God's house. I know several laymen, of limited acquaintance and observation among the clergy, who for many years have gauged the religious status of the general ministry by the revealed character of a clerical renegade, who, when everything went smoothly appeared to very good advantage, but under the stress of opposition revealed a most resentful and maliciously wicked heart.

Another reason why many people remain away from church, is because their minister preaches long sermons. I know that ministers do not like to be dictated to in this respect. I will not therefore run the risk of incurring their displeasure by advising the exact number of minutes a sermon should occupy, but I will venture to suggest that it is a mistake to preach longer than you can hold the interest of your audience. I have heard preachers, who did not seem to know if they had the interest of their audience or not, or if they did, they did not properly appreciate the importance of this principle as a guide. Some of the grandest sermons I have ever heard, did not occupy more than thirty or thirty-five minutes. I have heard choice and enduring gems delivered in less time. I have also listened to excellent sermons, which held the close attention of the audience for the first half hour, but when extended to forty-five and fifty minutes, interest flagged, impatience supervened, and the excellence of the first half of the sermon became completely overshadowed and neutralized by the tediousness of the latter half. It may be accepted as an axiom, that long sermons and empty pews go together. There are, of course, great subjects, on great occasions manned by great orators, which can easily command interested attention for an hour, or even two hours, but these are exceptional instances and should be so regarded. The quan-

tity of material furnished is not a good gauge by which to estimate sermons. It often seems to me that preaching is measured by the same rule as regulates the professional pedestrian,—so many feet to the lap, so many laps to the mile, and a given number of miles makes the full measure of obligation. Preaching should not be a matter of rods and furlongs, but should be made "the power of God unto salvation," and a sermon composed of padding and platitudes, may easily discourage an earnest inquiring soul, and divert his attention forever. Advocates of long sermons tell us that we can go to the theatre or circus, and sit several hours uncomplainingly, and seem to enjoy it. This argument is utterly untenable. When once the minister attempts to draw a parallel between the consecrated ministrations of God's house and Barnum's circus, with its "three rings and three clowns," the gilded trappings and paraphernalia or equestrian pageantry, the "ground and lofty tumblings" of athletes, and the thousand and one attractions of the "greatest show on earth"—such a minister, who is disposed to make such a comparison, should "with prayer and fasting" seek the privacy of his closet, and honestly endeavor to realize the vital differences between the two occasions, and I believe he will discover that the comparison is as irrelevant as it is positively odious.

Good and bad, as applied to qualities, are relative terms, and their standards vary. There are sermons that are considered good by some and poor by others, but there are types of sermons which are universally condemned as tedious and uninteresting. Of this class is the analytical and descriptive, which generally contains numerous hypothetical addenda. As for example some years ago I heard a sermon based on the pilgrimage made by that "certain man, who went down from Jerusalem to Jericho and fell among thieves." The speaker seemed quite distressed that neither the family name, the Christian name, nor the surname of this unfortunate individual was given; neither his nationality, nor his religious sect nor the various statistical items which pertain to a man, as a person and as a citizen. The lack of all this desirable information made this "certain man" a very uncertain man indeed. A very graphic description of the wilderness of Jericho was then given; its geography, topogra-

phy and sociology; its geological and paleontological peculiarities and possibilities, served up with all the irrelevant adjuncts which an imaginative mind can supply. And then concerning this "certain man" himself—his ventures, his adventures, his misadventures, and all the thrilling peradventures, which might, could, would or should have occurred whilst traveling through that very blood-curdling region. And then the horrible wounds and intense bodily sufferings of this mysterious traveler were described with such minuteness of detail and such vividness of portrayal as to quite eclipse the horrors of statement contained in the medical and surgical annals of our late civil war. Perhaps such sermons are of a high spiritual order, and emanate only from the most profound intellects, but all the same, they make many people very tired, and are accountable for many vacant pews in church.

A special series of sermons based on a particular theme, or on some prominent Bible character, is a favorite practice with many ministers, notwithstanding the fact, that unless managed with extreme tact and wisdom, they as rule become very monotonous and tedious to the hearers. Companion sermons, on similar, or oppositely suggestive themes, treated in two or three discourses, can be made extremely interesting and profitable, and to this kind I do now refer. Let me illustrate my point: A highly esteemed ministerial friend of mine at one time essayed to preach a series of sermons on "The Prodigal Son." One day after he had preached about five of these sermons, a few being still in reserve, he met one of his genial members on the street, who happened to be carrying a very large blank book, and the minister, out of good natured curiosity, asked him why he was carrying so large a book; to this, the member with ready wit responded, that he was getting up a subscription with which to bury "the prodigal son." The preacher, who is largely endowed with common sense, besides real piety and ministerial dignity, accepted the facetious reply with courteous acquiescence, took the well intentioned hint, and did not preach the concluding sermons on "the prodigal son." These sermons, besides being very exhaustive of the subject, are also very exhaustive

of the congregation, and are sure to lessen the general attendance.

If a sermon is to awaken any interest, it should surely, at least, possess three qualities. It should be of such a nature and so presented, that the mind can understand it, the memory recall it, and the soul feast upon it. Personally, I believe I have an average intellect, an average memory, and an average spiritual appreciation of God's word. On this basis I measure the merits of the sermons I hear. Now, if on returning from church I am able to recall the preacher's theme, and a fair outline of the discourse, then I feel as if I had gained something, and am encouraged to "call again." But if I am only barely able to give the text, and then get lost in the mazy labyrinths of mystification whilst endeavoring to recall the avalanche of scriptural references, the wordy platitudes and the irrelevant amplifications of truisms which composed the sermon, then do I feel, like I imagine the disciples felt, when it is recorded that they "toiled all night and caught nothing." I must confess that I have not the the courage to make such experiments very often.

We are often told about the parable in which "a sower went forth to sow." The sower is the preacher, the seed is the word of God, the soil is the heart of the hearer. We are frequently informed that the only duty of the sower is to sow the seed, and that he can in no wise be held responsible for the condition of the soil. Now I protest against such an indolent, evasive, and false interpretation of this parable. The preacher comes to us and he says, I am the Lord's messenger, here is the message he sends, it is your duty to receive it, or be eternally lost,—and immediately he gathers his ordination vestments about him, and with official strides he proceeds to furnish other miserable sinners with like information. Now when I was a farmer's son, and somewhat devoted to agriculture, I remember very well that we considered ourselves responsible for the condition of the soil, as well as for the kind of seed we sowed. In this parable of the sower, I believe the figure will justify us in holding the sower responsible for the condition of the soil,—or in other words, the preacher is responsible, to a large extent at least, for



the receptive and responsive condition of the hearts of his hearers. Some years ago, a ministerial friend of mine, who belongs to another denomination than ours, preached in one of our churches, whilst attending the sessions of his synod, then convened in that town. In speaking to me afterwards of this occurrence, he told me that he had never preached with greater personal comfort or satisfaction; the people, he said, gave him their close attention, and really seemed to enjoy what he had to say. Such receptiveness on the part of the people, was not a surprise to me, for I knew the pastor well, and also knew that he was an adept at keeping the soil in order. This right state of the soil, this receptive and responsive condition on the part of the church membership, is brought about by that attention and interest, which we have already referred to, and which centres to a considerable extent about the personality of the preacher himself,—his sociability, his aptness as an interpreter of human nature, the respect and reverence which he develops toward himself by his consistent Christian character and his fidelity to high religious principles. These are the things which open the heart, and make it receptive of the divine message. Under these conditions, the gospel is received as a message of love, and not as an official communication.

There is another glaring blunder, chiefly committed by those who speak oftenest and loudest about their fidelity in sowing the seed of God's word. They preach and preach and preach, and take great credit as to the amount of seed they sow, and the regularity with which they do it; and because nothing ever comes of it, they complacently fold their arms and blame the soil, saying they have nothing to do with that. Now it is often found that on account of the manner, means and methods by which they do their sowing, the seed itself becomes dwarfed, shriveled, devitalized, and thus they go on sowing "screenings" all their life time, and are obtuse enough to expect crops from such sowings. Well, if a sower doesn't know the difference between screenings and good wheat, he is deserving of failure every time, and he is sure to get it. A lifeless membership and empty pews are inevitable results.

But I will hasten to close this article, already too long. Let

me simply say in conclusion, on behalf of us laymen, that we are not half so unreasonable as we are sometimes taken to be. We can be argued with, coaxed, and even at times coerced, if it is decently and judiciously done. We like strong preaching, and truth honestly and fearlessly spoken. We like to be hit, provided the blow is given with proper interest and in accordance with gospel rules. We dislike this perambulating, and discussive sort of preaching, which is too "spready" to arouse a purpose, and too tiresome to claim respectful attention. Give us a man, a human man, so to speak, not so thickly covered with ecclesiastical varnish, or so puffed up with the divinity of his mission, but that he can come down and meet us on the basis of a common humanity, and by methods adapted to our natures, gain our confidence, secure our interest, and instruct us in those blessed truths of God's word, which we are assured will make us wise unto eternal salvation. Do this, and we pledge the fidelity of our hearts, and the service of our hands. Our pews at church shall be occupied, and we will be ready to cheerfully coöperate with our pastors, in devising ways and means, to secure the attendance at church of the masses, whom we so much wish to influence for Christ.

---

#### ARTICLE IV.

##### THE SACRAMENTARIAN CONTROVERSY.

[Concluded from Vol. XVIII, p. 183].

By PROF. J. W. RICHARD, D. D., Springfield, Ohio.

#### V.

In this same year (1536) Calvin published his *Institutio*, and in the next year his *Confessio Fidei de Eucharistia*, in which, according to Schaff (*Creeds*, I. p. 455), he makes an ingenious compromise between Luther and Zwingli in the matter of the Lord's Supper; which, however, is denied by many profound and capable students of doctrine, who maintain that Calvin's view of the Eucharist is both new and original, and that it was not constructed with any regard to the view of either Luther or Zwingli. Leaving this as a question for Calvinists to settle

among themselves, it seems to us very doubtful whether Calvin ever fully understood Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, inasmuch (*a*) as all of Luther's sacramentarian writings are in the German language, which Calvin did not understand; (*b*) he did not have that deep spiritual intuition, the possession of which enabled Luther to penetrate so profoundly into the mysteries of salvation; (*c*) he did not equally with Luther grasp the Chalcedonic faith of the person of Christ in its full significance.

And as for the reference to Zwingli, it is certain that Calvin's view of the Lord's Supper contains, in its dogmatic development and practical application, very little that is really distinctive in Zwingli's view, which he calls *profane* (*Gieseler*, IV. p. 415), but much that in these respects closely approximates the doctrine of Luther. In two points, however, he is in principle (though by no means does he go to the same extent in the application of the principle in either case), somewhat in the same line with Zwingli, viz.: He denies the *full, literal* meaning of the words of institution; he verges towards a Nestorianizing view of the person of Christ; which may explain in part why it is that as a matter of fact the majority of Calvinists are practically Zwinglian on the subject of the Lord's Supper. But as against Zwingli, Calvin recognizes the sacrament as a means of grace; declares that Christians have real communion with (eating and drinking) the very substance of the body and blood of Christ, but by the power and instrumentality of faith, and through the agency of the Holy Ghost who in the act of communion lifts the soul up to heaven, there to receive Christ in a manner not less real and true and substantial than that conceived of by Luther. That is, the eating and drinking the substance of Christ as emphasized by both Luther and Calvin in unmistakable language, is spiritual and immaterial, illocal and incapable of being comprehended by the reason. The only difference between the two views at this point, is, that according to Luther the eating and drinking take place here on the earth; according to Calvin the eating and drinking take place in heaven. But the thing eaten and the thing drunk, are the same with both, viz.: the veritable substance of Christ, his body and his blood which were given for

us.\* At this point Calvin says in his Institutes: "In his Holy Supper Christ bids me under the symbols of bread and wine take his body and blood, eat and drink; nor do I doubt but that he truly gives and I receive." This, without doubt, is the essential thing in the sacrament, and brings the two views into practical harmony, for as to whether this real presence and eating and drinking of the substance of Christ, occur on earth or in heaven, must be regarded as a matter entirely secondary, and as belonging to the sphere of speculative dogmatics, rather than as demanding expression in an article of faith, since the scriptures do not specify the locality in which the communion of the body and blood of Christ take place; although that we may not be misunderstood, we do not hesitate to decide for ourselves in favor of the view of Luther, viz., that the participation takes place on earth, as it seems to us far more reasonable, and if philosophy is at all to enter here, far more philosophical, to conceive that the communion takes place where the Supper is dispensed.

These views of Calvin, first set forth in the *Institutio* and in the *Confessio*, were more fully elaborated in the *De Coena Domini* (French 1540, Latin 1545), in which he declares "that all the benefit which we should seek in the Supper is annihilated if Jesus Christ be not there given to us as the substance and foundation." \* \* "For this reason I am wont to say that the substance of the sacraments is the Lord Jesus, and the efficacy of them the graces and blessings which we have by his means. Now the efficacy of the Supper is to confirm to us the reconciliation which we have with God through our Saviour's death and passion; the washing of our souls which we have in the shedding of his blood; the righteousness which we have in his obe-

---

\*Marheinecke in his *Institutiones Symbolicae* says of Calvin's view: "Denique mysterium sublime ac ratione superius in sacra coena deprehenditur. Docetur a Calvino vera, realis, substantialis in sacra coena praesentia corporis ac sanguinis Christi, sed fide tantum animadvertenda et amplectenda signisque figurata; non admittitur localis ulla praesentia (a Luthero ipso negata) aut literalis verborum Domine interpretatio; docetur fideles tantum et electos veritate corporis et sanguinis Christi participes fieri, reprobis et infidelibus contra nil nisi signa administrari." p. 106.

dience, in short, the hope of salvation which we have in all that he has done for us. It is necessary, then, that the substance should be conjoined with these, otherwise nothing would be firm or certain. Hence we conclude that two things are presented to us in the Supper, viz., Jesus Christ as the source and substance of all good; and, secondly, the fruit and efficacy of his death and passion. This is implied in the words which were used. For after commanding us to eat his body and to drink his blood, he adds that his body was delivered for us, and his blood shed for the remission of our sins. Here he intimates, first, that we ought not simply to communicate in his body and blood, without any other consideration, but in order to receive the fruit derived to us from his death and passion; secondly, that we can attain the enjoyment of such fruit only by participating in his body and blood, from which it is derived." \* \*

"To deny that a true communication of Jesus Christ is presented to us in the Supper, is to render the holy sacrament frivolous and useless—an execrable blasphemy unfit to be listened to."

\* \* "As the bread is distributed to us by the hand, so the body of Christ is communicated to us in order that we may be made partakers of it." He further declares that Jesus Christ is the substance of the sacrament, and that the bread and wine are instruments by which the Lord distributes his body and blood."

(See *Calvin's Tracts*, II. p. 164 et seq. English Translation).

These views of Calvin as expressed in the *Institutio*\* and in the *Confessio* were so acceptable at Wittenberg that Luther in a letter (Oct. 14, 1539) to Bucer, his "most dear brother in Christ," commands: "You will salute reverently Drs. John Sturm and John Calvin, whose books I have read with great delight." (*De Wette*, V. p. 211). Melancthon also wrote: "Luther and Pommeranus have sent salutations to Calvin and Sturm. Calvin has come into high favor." This so surprised and gratified Calvin that he wrote to Farel (Nov. 20, 1539): "Now consider seriously

\*It is altogether probable that Luther had read the second and greatly enlarged edition of the *Institutio*, published in August, 1539, while Calvin was at Strasburg. And Dörner is in error when he says (*Hist. Prot. Theol.*, I. p. 407) that Luther sent his salutations to Calvin on account of the *De Coena Domini*, for this treatise had not yet been published.

what I have said there about the Eucharist; think of the ingenuousness of Luther: it will now be easy for you to see how unreasonable are those who so obstinately dissent from him." (*Bonnet's Calvin's Letters*, II. p. 167). And Christopher Pezel (see *Gieseler*, IV. p. 415, n.) relates the following anecdote of Luther: On reading the *De Coena Domini* which had been sent him by Moritz Golsch, a Wittenberg bookseller, he exclaimed: "Moritz, this is certainly a learned and pious man, with whom I could at the very beginning have settled the whole matter of this strife. I confess for my part that if the opposite party had acted in this way we would have been agreed at the outstart. For had Oecolampadius and Zwingli expressed themselves thus we would never have fallen into such prolix controversy."\* But that Lu-

\*This speech is nowhere recorded in any of Luther's writings hitherto discovered; but it is accepted as historically true by such Reformed as Hospinian, Henry, Gieseler *et al.*, and as at least expressing the true sentiment of Luther it is accepted by such Lutherans as Dr. Julius Müller and Dr. C. F. Schaeffer. (See *Evangelical Review*, X. p. 65). And not less did Calvin believe himself to be in essential harmony with Luther. In his answer to Westphal (1556) he says: "When on beginning to emerge from the darkness of Papacy, and after receiving a slight taste of sound doctrine, I read in Luther that Zwinglius and Oecolampadius left nothing in the sacraments but bare and empty figures, I confess I took such a dislike for their writings that I long refrained from reading them. Moreover, before I engaged in writing, the ministers of Marpurg having a conference together, had laid aside somewhat of their former vehemence, so that if the atmosphere was not altogether clear, the denser mists had to a considerable extent disappeared. What I justly claim for myself is, that I never by employing an ambiguous mode of expression captiously brought forward anything different from my real sentiment. After I thus made my appearance without disguise, none of the dissentients then in highest fame and authority gave any sign of offence. For I was afterwards brought into familiar intercourse with the leading advocates and keenest defenders of Luther's opinions, and they all vied in showing me friendship. Nay, what opinion Luther himself formed of me, after he had inspected my writings, can be proved by competent witnesses. One will serve me for many—Philip Melancthon." \* \* "Gasper Cruciger subscribed with me in sentiment, and privately declared it as much as those who openly gave their names." \* \* "In regard to the Confession of Augsburg my answer is, that (as it was published at Ratisbon) it does not contain a word contrary to our doctrine" (*Tracts*, II. p. 251 et seq.) Sleidan says (*Hist. Ref.*, p. 272,

ther should so express himself in regard to the Eucharistic sentiments of Calvin, is not surprising, when we consider as Dorner says (*Hist. Prot. Theol.*, I. p. 407), that "Calvin had carried the matter back essentially to the standpoint of the *Swabian Syngamma*," which Luther had so heartily endorsed in two prefaces, and which expressly denies *oral manducation*, and declares emphatically in favor of a spiritual reception by *faith* as the *organ*: *ut fides verbum, quod oribus capitur, pro sua ratione recepit, ita et corpus, quod pane accipitur, pro ratione fidei assumitur*, and which as Köstlin says (*Luther's Theologie*, II. p. 144), "manifestly knows nothing of the reception of the body of Christ into the bodies of the communicants, much less into the bodies of the unbelieving." That is, Calvin, who closed his *De Coena Domini* with these words: "We all confess with one mouth, that on receiving the sacrament in faith, according to the ordinance of the Lord, we are truly made partakers of the proper substance of the body and blood of Christ" (*Calvin's Tracts*, II. p. 197), had reached essentially the Lutheran standpoint, so that as Dorner says (I. p. 407), "the new attack [against the Zwinglians after the publication of Zwingli's writings] made by Luther in the Smaller Confession of 1544, in no way applied to Calvin." That is, taking into consideration all these facts, viz., that Luther sent his congratulations to Calvin, and spoke so kindly of him to Golsch, that as shown by the *Syngamma*, ORAL MANDUCATION is no *essential* part of Luther's view, and so likewise the *eating of the ungodly*, as shown both by the *Syn-*

Bohn's Trans., 272): "The Duke of *Saxony* sent thither (to Ratisbon) a splendid embassy of divines," and Seckendorf says (Lib. III. 23, p. 352 et seq.), that the Protestants made no innovation in the articles of their faith, and subscribed the formula: "Fatemur, in coena Domini vere et realiter corpus et sanguinem Christi adesse, et cum pane et vino exhiberi sumentibus," which no one imagined to be in any sense a modification of Luther's views, and which was and had been for a long time a well-known formula of Lutheran confession, as witness the doctrinal statement of the Wurtemberg churches: "Corpus et sanguinem Christi vere, *i. e.* substantialiter et essentialiter, non autem quantitative vel localiter praesentia esse et exhiberi in coena." Kurtz, II. p. 79. See also the Apology. Moreover, it was the *Confessio Invariata* which was published and subscribed at Ratisbon.



gramma and by the *Wittenberg Concord*; and that Luther nowhere has left on record a line against Calvin's view—taking all these facts together, it is made historically and morally certain that Luther, while *not surrendering* his own views (see *Smaller Confession*), recognized the views of Calvin as sufficiently pious and Christian to meet all the demands of a sacrament as a means of grace, as a pledge of redemption, as a food for the soul, as a real communion of the body and blood of Christ, and hence that they ought not to be assailed, but to be tolerated as fully within the limits of concord. For it is simply unreasonable to suppose that Luther when writing his *Smaller Confession*, would have made no allusion to Calvin, had he thought that he was in any way tainted with the Zwinglian fanaticism, or lacked in any element fundamental to the Christian conception of the sacrament. And hence again, as at the *Wittenberg Concord*, we have the most conclusive evidence that Luther was not a narrow bigot, and that he was not stubbornly attached to his own form of words, but that on the contrary he could and did distinguish between that which is essential, and that which is subordinate in doctrine, and was perfectly willing to allow diverse verbal statements of doctrine, provided only that the essential truth was held; and that Calvin held the great body of truth in the sacrament, no one, unless blinded by prejudice, will deny, who has carefully examined his foundation. And hence it is that many profound theologians, both Reformed and Lutheran, have declared that the difference between the views is not irreconcilable. Among the latter we mention Kurtz (*Ch. Hist.*, II. p. 136), who says of Luther's *Shorter Confession*: "If this demonstrated an incurable rupture with the Zwinglians, it also showed that a union with the incomparably more profound doctrines of Calvin was possible." But it is demonstrable that on the one hand many of Luther's followers, and not a few of them at the present day, lay undue emphasis on certain subordinate parts of Luther's doctrine of the Real Presence, as for instance *oral manducation*, the sacramental union, and the eating of the unworthy; and on the other hand that many of Calvin's followers have strongly inclined towards the view of Zwingli.

But reconciliation, or a better understanding on this subject of the Lord's Supper, cannot be effected along the line of either of these extremes. It must come from the acceptance of the true Christology as expressed by the third and fourth general councils, which requires that wherever Christ is, there he is whole and entire as man not less than as God, and that he is with his people without regard to locality or space. It was the non-recognition of this principle, that is, the location of the human nature of Christ in heaven as in a separate place, that begat and continued the Sacramentarian Controversy. A better, truer, more historically correct Christology is now finding recognition and expression in the Reformed Churches, as witness what we quoted above (see Vol. XVIII. p. 168, n.) from Drs. Hodge and Hitchcock, and the following from Dr. Apple of the Reformed Seminary at Lancaster, Pa.: "It may be asked, must not the human *body* of our Lord occupy space? Must *it* not be in some given place? No, we reply, because his body is now a spiritual body, which means it is no longer subject to the limitations of time and space."\* It was that false Nestorianizing

\* Dr. Apple makes an almost unpardonable error in the following: "Both parties (Lutheran and Reformed) argued on the supposition that our Lord Jesus Christ, as to his human nature, is still under the limitations of space. The Lutheran *ubiquity* was nothing more nor less than omnipresence in space." That the Reformed doctrine and confessions locate the human nature of Christ in space is most certain. In these two sentences of Dr. Apple there are at least three points of objection as regards the Lutheran doctrine:

1. The separation of the human nature of Christ from the divine. The Lutheran doctrine affirms that the two natures are so firmly and inseparably united in the one person of Christ, that wherever the divine is, there the human must be. (See *Luther's Greater Confession* and *Form of Concord*).

2. In the Marburg Colloquy the Lutherans distinctly and expressly denied that the body of Christ is subject to the limitations of space. (See *Zwingli's Works*, IV. p. 177. Also *Lutheran Quarterly*, Vol. XVIII. p. 174). Melancthon in explaining Luther's doctrine while the Diet of Augsburg was yet in session, says: "Although we say that the body of Christ is really present, yet Luther does not say that it is present in a place, as in a mass by circumscription." "We deny transubstantiation and that the body is locally in the bread." (*Cælestine*

Christology which subsequently received confessional recognition in the Heidelberg Catechism and elsewhere, that led to Luther's exposition of the different modes of Christ's presence and to the hasty suggestion of a potential ubiquity of the body of Christ (because of the personal union),—not so much as an explanation, and not at all as the ground of the real presence, but as a set-off and an answer to Zwingli's location theory, which fixed the body of Christ in heaven and denied that it could possibly be on the earth.\*

But if we are to take Drs. Hodge, Hitchcock and Apple as representative teachers of the Calvinistic and Reformed Christology of to-day, we may truly say that a formidable barrier to a better understanding is removed. In addition, also, Dr. Hodge expressly rejects Calvin's dynamical theory, and calls it mechanical (*Popular Lectures*, pp. 413-4), and declares his "unshaken faith, not in abstract, material flesh and blood, but in the actual objective, effective presence with the believing communicant of the whole divine-human Person of Christ." And as for Dr. Apple, the entire article from which we quote, goes upon the same principle of a true objective presence of the whole Christ in the Eucharist here on earth, and is indeed so appropriately Lutheran in its whole teaching (barring the error already noted) that

*Hist.* III. 300; *Corp. Ref.* II. 222 *et seq.*) At the Wittenberg Concord, Bucer and the other Strasburgers were required expressly to deny, as a condition precedent to union, that the body of Christ is in a place. (*Seckendorf*, III. 15, 47). And the Concord itself agreed upon and signed by "both parties," denies that Christ's body is present in the Supper as in a place. See *Luth. Quarterly*, Vol. XVIII. p. 166 *et seq.*)

3. Luther's doctrine was not founded on the ubiquity of Christ's body. (See *Luth. Quarterly*, XVIII. p. 167, n.). He only taught in opposition to Zwingli's location theory that Christ (the whole Christ, not his body merely) could be wherever he wished to be, which differs nothing from Dr. Apple's own declaration that Christ is "no longer subject to the limitations of time and space," which Luther's *Grosses Bekenntniss* clearly proves. Our wonder is that the Lutheran, which is so zealous for pure doctrine, should have given to its readers, unchallenged, such an incorrect statement of Lutheran doctrine.

\*The Heid. Cat. says: "Christ is true man and true God: according to his human nature, he is now not upon earth."—*Ques.* 47. This of course is to divide Christ.

it was deemed worthy of a place in *The Lutheran* of February 2, 1888. Dr. Apple expressly says of the two views, Lutheran and Reformed: "There is no difference as to the real presence in the Eucharist; both Churches teach it. As to the theory of the presence, the nature of the relation of the body and blood of our Lord to the elements, and their reception by believers and unbelievers partaking of the sacrament, a difference still remains;" which in reality reduces the difference to the questions of ORAL MANDUCATION, the SACRAMENTAL UNION, and the reception of the substance of Christ by the *ungodly*. These questions, as his relation to the *Swabian Syngamma* and the *Wittenberg Concord* unanswerably prove, Luther did not regard as an essential part of a true doctrine of the Lord's Supper. And it is certain that these subjects would never have found a place in the Lutheran system, had they not been forced into view through opposition to the Schwarmgeister, who denied *in toto* a bodily presence and reception of the substance of Christ. Moreover, it cannot be denied that they belong to the sphere of inference and deduction rather than to that of the plain didactic import of the divine word, which alone can form articles of faith; they find no place in either the Marburg or the Swabach or the Torgau Articles or the Augsburg Confession, and were especially repudiated by John Brentz, who next to Luther and Melancthon was the greatest theologian of his age, and was always in special favor with his brethren. Hence whatever may be the prejudices, the preferences and the dogmatic conceptions of Lutherans in regard to these features of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, they cannot ignore the very great subordination, both real and historical, of these features to the one supreme feature on which Luther justly laid so much stress, and defended so manfully in the Marburg Colloquy and stated so concisely in both the Marburg and the Swabach Articles. Therefore taking the Lutheran doctrine as that which Luther defended at Marburg, and wrote in the articles above-mentioned, and confessed in the Augustana; and taking the Calvinistic or Reformed doctrine as the real substantial presence and eating and drinking of the essence of Christ, as so clearly enunciated by Calvin, and adding to it the Christological views of Drs. Hodge,

Hitchcock and Apple—doing this, we will find that the difference is one which has no appreciable value for theology or for practical Christian life. In either case we will find a doctrine which contains a correct Christology, and a sacrament which feeds our souls, strengthens our faith and nourishes body, soul and spirit unto everlasting life. More than this can not be required as a condition of Christian fellowship. More than this was not required by either Luther or Melancthon, as history incontestably and unanswerably proves; yea, both were so well pleased with the view of Calvin, that notwithstanding its somewhat defective Christology, they not only saw nothing in it worthy of strife, but, on the contrary, such a close approximation to the fulness of the truth as brought its author into high favor at Wittenberg and called forth Luther's salutations, and the declaration that with this man he could easily have settled the dispute.

Are the Reformed now ready to adopt the Christological principles of Drs. Hodge, Hitchcock and Apple, and to combine with them the real substantial presence and eating and drinking of the very substance of Christ as so unequivocally declared by Calvin in the *De Coena Domini*? Are the Lutherans ready to relegate to the realm of purely dogmatic discussion and to the precincts of private judgment, the questions about the organ of reception, the sacramental union and the relation of the body and blood to the wicked? What we need to know and to believe in this sublime mystery of the Christian faith is that in the Eucharist Christ communicates his theanthropic self to every one who truly apprehends the words, "This is my body which was broken for you; this cup is the New Testament in my blood shed for you for the remission of sins." More than this can not be plainly established from the divine word; more than this did not at any time exist in the ancient Church; more than this ought not to be required of any man as a condition of ecclesiastical fellowship.

We close this chapter of our paper with the inquiry of Dr. Apple: "Is it not time that the Lutheran and Reformed Churches should review this controversy and seek to come together? If this difference would once be resolved it would go

far towards bringing in harmony in a more general way between Lutheran and Reformed theology."

## VI.

This study of the Sacramentarian Controversy would not be complete if it should fail to include an examination of the claim made by the Reformed, and fully conceded by many stringent Lutherans, viz., that Melanchthon abandoned the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper and accepted that of Calvin. Loescher says (*Historia Matucem*, 2, 23): "Many Reformed and especially Hospinian represent that Melanchthon openly and secretly propagated the Calvinistic doctrine in writing and by word of mouth, not only after Luther's death, but before." Dr. Schaff says *Reformed Quarterly*, July 1887, p. 298): "His (Melanchthon's) eucharistic theory closely approached that of Calvin," and declares (*Creeds*, I. 241, n.) that *exhibeantur* is more indefinite than *distribuantur*. Dr. Fisher says (*Hist. Christ. Church*, 1887, p. 324): "Melanchthon gradually came over to his (Calvin's) view of the Sacrament;" and again (*ibid.*, p. 424): "Melanchthon's departure from Luther on the question of the Lord's Supper." The first Lutherans who intimated that Melanchthon had inclined to the view of Calvin, were the Jena theologians, Wigand, Heshusius and Kirchner (*Walch, Introduc.*, p. 193, and *Streitigkeiten*, III. 75). In 1592 John Mattheus, professor of theology at Wittenberg, published a book in which he openly charged that Melanchthon had consented to the doctrine of Calvin and had changed the Confession for the purpose of propagating it.\* As the claim of the Reformed and the charge of some Lutherans are based upon Melanchthon's change in 1540 of the tenth article of the Confession, we begin our examination at that point by giving the article both unchanged and changed.

## UNCHANGED.

*De Coena Domini docent, quod corpus et sanguis Christi VERE AD-SINT et DISTRIBUANTUR vescentibus in Coena Domini; ET IMPROBANT SECUS DOCENTES.*

## CHANGED.

*De Coena Domini docent, quod CUM PANE ET VINO vere EXHIBE-ANTUR corpus et sanguis Christi vescentibus in Coena Domini.*

\*Walch's *Introduc. in Lib. Symb.*, p. 193.

The question naturally arises, Why did Melanchthon make this change? Salig, who by common consent, has written the fullest, the fairest and the most impartial history\* of the Augsburg Confession, answers this question as follows: "The Wittenberg Concord [which Melanchthon had composed] is not in conflict with the unaltered Augsburg Confession, but is in all respects in conformity with it and explains more fully the controverted points. Now since the theologians of Upper Germany had received the Augsburg Confession, Melanchthon conceived that the bond of union would be greatly strengthened, if he should remove from the Augsburg Confession those words, which before had made concord difficult, because even yet at Strasburg the *Tetrapolitana* had not been fully abandoned. In this way he thought to make full harmony between the conflicting confessions; and because the theologians of Upper Germany had acted as mediators between the Swiss and the Saxon churches, he thought thus to reach a full understanding with them, inasmuch as the correspondence between the Swiss and Luther had not resulted in agreement. For this reason *Improbant secus docentes* was removed. *Vere adsint*, he thought, had occasioned the suspicion of a local inclusion. If these stones of stumbling could be removed, lasting peace must follow. Melanchthon who was in high esteem in the whole Lutheran Church, had attracted to Wittenberg from all quarters thousands of admiring youths. Hence when he conceived the idea of changing the Confession, it was an easy matter for him in so great a multitude of followers to execute his purpose, and to explain it not as a *change*, but as an *improvement* of the Augsburg Confession; and because he was universally regarded as its author, no one thought of blaming him, if he should more and more improve it, as he had done along from the year 1531. It took its place among the former *improvements* and *additions*, and the followers and other friends of Melanchthon took no offence, since they knew that he was unwearied in his efforts to bring about a complete union of the confessions. Melanchthon thought that in this way students from Upper Germany would

---

\* *Tom. I. p. 482.*



not hesitate to come to Wittenberg, and that the confessions would be nearer together than before. This then was Melancthon's real intention, viz.: so to order the Augsburg Confession as to do away with the scruples on account of which the people of Upper Germany had stumbled before the Wittenberg Concord, and had not been fully satisfied since, and thus to prepare the way for union of the Swiss and the Saxon churches through the intervention of Bucer, Capito and others." But now the question arises, Did this change in the tenth article mean that Melancthon had really changed his view of the Lord's Supper, and now accepted the view of Calvin? Or more generally, Is there any good and sufficient reason for believing that Melancthon accepted and propagated the Calvinistic view of the Lord's Supper?

Taking Salig's statement of the reason for the change as the true one, the first question must be answered in the negative. The change was made for the purpose of conciliating the cities of Upper Germany and of confirming the Wittenberg Concord. But the answer to the second question must take a much wider range.

1. Melancthon made the change in the year 1540.\* In that same year at the Colloquy of Worms Melancthon declared that he still adhered to the *Invariata*. (*Buddeus, Isagoge*, p. 477).

2. When Eck charged at the Colloquy of Worms that Melancthon had changed the Confession, the latter replied: "As

\*There is strong reason for believing that the *Variata* was made in the year 1538. This is the date given by Peucer, Melancthon's son-in-law, and by Selneccer. (See *Corp. Ref.*, XXVI. 341, 342). Cyprian (*Hist. Augs. Con.*, p. 145) accepts 1538 as the date of the change and says that in 1540 Melancthon took the varied Latin copy to Worms. This is probably the true explanation of the seeming conflict in dates. The variation which has now become famous was doubtless made in 1538, and was regarded as on a par with Melancthon's other changes and improvements, which may have been the reason why Luther instructed him to take it to Worms. If 1538 be the true date, as we believe it is, then Melancthon's letter of February 12, 1540, given in the text below, is itself alone decisive against the charge of intentional change of meaning, unless we are willing to charge him with the most shameless violation of the eighth commandment.

to the dissimilarity of copies, I answer that the meaning of the things is the same (*rerum eandem esse sententiam*) although some things here and there, in the later edition, are more free from harshness (*mitigata*) or are more explicit." (Quoted in *Salig*, III. p. 508, note, and *Corp. Ref.*, XXVI. p. 341). This corresponds exactly with what he wrote, September 2, 1535, to Camerarius, (*Corp. Ref.*, II. p. 935): "I now have softened (*mitigavi*) many things in my *Loci*." And again to the same, December 24, 1533, (*Corp. Ref.*, II. p. 1027) when discoursing of the Lord's Supper: "In my *Loci* even I seem as it were to have second thoughts. You see I do this that I may give some light to dark and intricate subjects." And yet in the edition of the *Loci* (1535) to which he refers, he declares: "Christ is truly present (*vere adest*) in his sacrament." And in 1538 (*Corp. Ref.* III. p. 514) he writes to Veit Theodorus: "In those things which are given, Christ is truly present (*vere adesse*) and is efficacious." This though softened in language is still the true Lutheran doctrine, and if perchance it could awaken any doubt, that doubt would be put to flight by the Wittenberg Concord, which all agree is in full harmony with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession. Hence as the learned Krauth says (*Conserv. Reformation*, p. 247): "If Melancthon consciously made a change of meaning in the Confession, it is impossible to defend him from the charge of direct falsehood." He simply stated the truth in the premises, and as a matter of fact had actually used the same form of expression in the *Loci* of 1535: "*Datis his rebus, pane et vino in Coena Domini, exhibentur nobis corpus et sanguis Christi.*"

3. At the Diet of Ratisbon, 1541, Melancthon signed the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, and again at Worms in 1557, and acknowledged in addition as his Creed, the Apology and the Smalcald Articles, and by name and in writing condemned the Zwinglian doctrine. At Nuremberg he said: "Calvin knows as much about the Lord's Supper as my sleeve. I will have to write him again on the subject." To the Elector Augustus he said, "We stand by the Catechism and the Confession of Luther,

and by the grace of God will continue to stand by them." (*Salig*, Tom. I. p. 488).

4. The *Corpus Doctrinae Philippicum* to which Melanchthon wrote a preface only a few weeks before he died, contains *inter alia* (a) The Apology unchanged. (b) The Repetition of the Augsburg Confession, written by Melanchthon in 1551, to be sent to the Council of Trent, and signed by Melanchthon and thirty other theologians and pastors. The article on the Lord's Supper contains the following (p. 270): "In this communion Christ is truly and substantially present (*vere et substantialiter adesse*), and the body and blood of Christ are truly (*vere*) administered to those who commune"—in which it is not possible to discover any other than the purest type of catholic Luththeran doctrine; as likewise (c) in the *Examen Ordinandorum*: "What is the Lord's Supper? It is the communication of the body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ as it was instituted in the words of the Gospel, in the reception of which the Son of God is *truly* and *substantially* present." On the twelfth of February, 1540, the year in which the change in the Confession is said to have been made, Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen and Melanchthon, sent a long letter to the ministers of Nuremberg, in which they say: "In regard to doctrine we have decided positively, that ABSOLUTELY UNDER NO PRETEXT WHATEVER will we admit any change of ANY ARTICLE of the Confession and Apology." (*De Wette*, V. p. 263). This letter is found also in Peucer's edition of Melanchthon's letters, and was, as the style and other internal evidence clearly evince, written by Melanchthon. It is not possible to conceive that at this very time Melanchthon was *intentionally* and *consciously* changing the *meaning* of the Confession. And in this same year when he lay sick at Weimar and was thought to be dying, he wrote his *Confession and Testament*, (*Salig*, I. p. 476 and *Corpus. Ref.*, III. 825), "wherein he confessed the article of the Holy Supper according to the Wittenberg Concord." And Loescher tells us (*Hist. Mot.*, II. p. 143): "In this same year (1558) Melanchthon stated expressly in his German Examen that in the matter of the Lord's Supper he stands by the Catechism of Luther and the doctrine of the Lower Saxon churches, which had openly opposed Calvin."

5. Melanchthon made no change in the German Confession, "to which," says Hase (*Lib. Sym.*, p. ix.), "he had given greater care." It requires but a glance to see that the thesis of the tenth article in the *Variata* is closely conformed to that of the German text.

6. Melanchthon's contemporaries never charged him with apostasy from Luther's doctrine of the Lord's Supper. Loescher says (*Hist. Mot.*, II. p. 33) that Calovius has conclusively shown that Melanchthon was not a Calvinist so long as Luther lived. Peucer declares: "The later (editio emendatio Aug. Conf.) was written by Philip at the command and with the inspection and approbation of Luther; and it was necessary that it be written on account of the adversaries, because they were caviling at many things which it behooved to explain in order that the occasions and reasons for such cavils \* \* might be removed." Nic. Selnecker says: "The later Augsburg Confession was recognized, and was read again and approved by Luther, as witnesses still living affirm." And David Chytraeus and Martin Chemnitz "say, at least, that it was brought forward at the conference at Worms with the approbation of Luther." (See *Gieseler*, IV. p. 433, n. and *Corp. Ref.*, XXVI, 341). It is unreasonable to suppose that Luther could live in daily personal intercourse with Melanchthon and not know his true sentiments, or could approve the *Variata*, if he suspected that Melanchthon had consciously changed its meaning. Or if this supposition be entertained, then it proves more than the Reformed have ever claimed, more than the defamers of Melanchthon would allow, viz., that Luther himself had changed his doctrine, or had become indifferent to it. Nicholas Selnecker, one of the authors of the Form of Concord, wrote an answer to John Mettheus (See *Walch's Introductio*, p. 193, and *Salig's Historia Tom.*, I. p. 486) in which, while expressing his preference for the *Invariata*, he defends Melanchthon against the charge of forsaking Luther's doctrine, and contends that the change was made with good intention and with the hope of concord. He says: "We know that as regards matter and substance of doctrine nothing was in the least changed. Some things were illustrated and sometimes more fully explained, and that not by *private council*, but by the

*public authority of other teachers.* Wherefore if any say it was a mistake, I have no objection, provided no injury or reproach be brought upon pure doctrine and upon our preceptors and teachers." As paraphrased by Salig (*ibid.* p. 487) Selneccer declares that the Landgrave (Philip) had written to Melanchthon and begged him to omit the *improbant secus docentes* from the Confession, as that was the reason why the Swiss did not sign at Augsburg, and that they would sign it if this antithesis were omitted.

The evidence collected in this sixth paragraph shows beyond even the shadow of a doubt that not Melanchthon *alone* was responsible for the *Variata*. The responsibility must be shared by those who counseled its preparation, and who approved and used it after it was prepared; and hence in so far as it indicates a change of view in Melanchthon, in so far does it indicate a change of view in Luther himself and in others of our theologians. This conclusion is irrefutable.

But what are the facts adduced by those who maintain that Melanchthon abandoned the views of Luther and accepted those of Calvin? The Reformed rely on the *mitigation* in the *Loci* of 1535 and on the *variation* of the tenth Article of the Confession, which they call not a corruption but an improvement. (*Buddeus, Is.*, p. 477). The stringent Lutherans support their charge of change (a) by the statement of Wigand: "I heard from George Rorarius that Luther said to Philip, 'Philip, Philip, you do not do right in changing the Augsburg Confession so often. The book is not yours; it belongs to the Church.'" (See *Cyprian's Hist. Augs. Con.*, p. 150). But this much-flourished observation is given (1) as a mere *hearsay*, (2) by a bitter enemy of Melanchthon, (3) is without date, and may, if true, just as well have reference to Melanchthon's earlier changes of the Confession, (4) and can have no weight whatever as against the testimony of Peucer, Selneccer, Chytraeus and others as given above; (b) by the following facts allowed by Loescher (*Hist. Mot.*, II. p. 30): That Melanchthon did not assail the *Declaratio* of Calvin and Martyr written in 1549 in favor of the Zwinglians, but remained in friendship with them; that when Westphal wrote against them, Melanchthon in private letters manifested

his disapprobation; that he allowed Jo. a Lasco, a Zwinglian, to do as he pleased in Germany; that he did not resist but apologized for his pupil Hardenberg who at Bremen opposed the doctrine of Luther. These are the main facts relied on by both parties, viz., the Reformed and the stringent Lutherans, in support of the proposition that Melanchthon gradually abandoned the Eucharistic views of Luther and adopted those of Calvin. The reader is asked to weigh the facts adduced on the other side, and to draw his own conclusion.

There is, however, one more point on which the same two parties agree in support of the same proposition. It is found in the statement of Dr. Schaff (*Creeds*, I. p. 241, n.), that EXHIBEANTUR is "more indefinite" than DISTRIBUTANTUR.

1. This contradicts Melanchthon's express statement of his reason for making the change. He told Eck that he had changed the Confession in order to make it more *explicit*, not more *indefinite*. And Selneccer declared that the changes in the *Variata* make it clearer and plainer. (*Salig*, III. p. 487, n.)

2. The word *Exhibeo*, as used by the theological writers of the sixteenth century, means *to present, to give, to deliver*. The standard and almost invariable Latin title of the Augsburg Confession is: "*Confessio Fidei Exhibita* \* \* *Carolo V. Cæsari*. No one will pretend that the word *Exhibita* does not here describe one of the most definite acts known in history. The Confession was *presented* to the Emperor, not merely *tendered*, which might imply that it was not received, as Zwingli *tendered* his hand to Luther, who did not receive it. Hence Dr. Jacobs is inconsistent when in the title of the Confession (*Book of Concord*, I. p. 33) he translates the word by *presented*, and in the Apology and *Variata* by *tendered* and in the Wittenberg Concord by *offered*.

3. In the Apology Melanchthon used *Exhibeantur* to express exactly what in the Confession he had expressed by *Distribuantur*. His full statement here is: *Vere et substantialiter adsint corpus et sanguis Christi, et VERE EXHIBEANTUR cum his rebus, quae videntur, pane et vino*. It is inconceivable that here in the Apology, Melanchthon's most positive and dogmatic work, he should have intended to be more *indefinite* than in the Confes-

sion. When asked, as it were, what he means in the Confession by *vere adsint et distribuantur*, he replies in the Apology: *Vere et substantialiter adsint, et vere exhibeantur*. And *vere exhibeantur* which as used by Melanchthon in the Apology, is the chief thing, and means that the body and blood of Christ are *truly presented*, or *communicated* to those who eat in the Lord's Supper, cannot mean something *less*, or something more *indefinite* in the *Variata*. The phrase had become technical already, and had acquired *symbolical* authority in the Lutheran theology. Yea, Luther, even before Melanchthon had published the Apology, had used the phrase: "We confess that the body of Christ is *truly presented*, (*vere exhiberi*) to the soul for food." (*De Wette*, IV. p. 216).

4. The dogmaticians, in stating the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, show *emphatic* preference for *Exhibeo*.

(a.) Chemnitz in his *Fundamenta Sacrae Coenae*, the standard Lutheran dogmatic treatise on the Supper, has for the title of his book, and for the title of the third chapter: "*De Praesentia, Exhibitione et sumptione Corporis et Sanguinis Domini*"; and, p. 16, he writes: *Paulus affirmat \* \* exhibitionem et sumptionem illius panis, esse exhibitionem et participationem Corporis Christi, \* \* unâ exhibitâ simul altera exhibeatur*; and throughout the treatise, to the almost utter exclusion of every other word of similar import, does he again and again use *Exhibeo* and *Exhibitio* in setting forth the *presenting* or *administering* of the body and blood in the Eucharist.

(b.) In the *Strasburg Formula* of 1563, prepared and signed in express opposition to the Calvinistic doctrine of the Lord's Supper and of Predestination, we have the words: "Body and blood of Christ which with the bread and wine are *presented*" (*exhibentur*)—the very form of the *Variata*, except that it lacks the *vere*. (Found in Loescher's *Hist. Mot.*, II. p. 229).

(c.) In the Saxon Visitation Articles (1592), the most positive confessional exhibition of Lutheran doctrine ever written, we have in the article on the Lord's Supper, *Exhibeo* used three times: "In the sacrament there are two things which are *presented* (*exhibentur*) and at the same time received. This union, *presentation* (*exhibitio*) and reception, take place here on earth. The



true and natural body of Christ is *presented* (*exhibeatur*) and received." The word in the German text corresponding to *Exhibeo*, is *geben*, to *give*.

(d.) In Heunisch's *Analytical Epitome of Hutter's Compend.*, p. 262, we have: "The *form* of the Supper consists partly in the *giving* (*δόσει*) or *presenting* (*exhibitione*) of the body of Christ with the bread, and of the blood of Christ with the wine" —in which again we see the very phraseology of the *Variata*.

(e.) Gerhard repeatedly employs *Exhibitio*, as, X. pp. 134, 159, (Cotta). The fact is, the dogmaticians use the word *Exhibitio* more frequently than all other words put together, to state the peculiar Lutheran doctrine that the body and blood of Christ are *presented, administered*, to those who eat in the sacrament. They often distinguish between *distributio panis* and *exhibitio Corporis et sanguinis*. *Distributio* is more properly applied to the earthly elements of the sacrament, which are *distributed*, in the sense that each communicant gets a *part* of the consecrated bread and wine. But there is no such *distribution* of the body and blood of Christ. The *whole Christ*, according to the Lutheran doctrine, is presented to each communicant *in, with and under* each distributed *part* of the consecrated earthly elements. In the supper the natural elements are *distributed*, but the supernatural element is *presented*, and there is no word in the Latin language which can more elegantly and definitely set forth this latter conception than the word *Exhibeo*.

Therefore, all these examples considered, we do not hesitate to say that any effort that may be made to disparage the *Exhibeo* of the *Variata*, is met by a most emphatic protest from the creeds of the Church and from her greatest theologians, who certainly understood the meaning of Latin words, and knew quite as well how to use them as either their admirers or their critics of the present day. Hence, while no more approving, as an act, the *variation* of the Augsburg Confession in any article, than we approve, as an act, the introduction of the *Filioque* into the Nicaenum; nevertheless, after traversing again and again the whole ground of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, we do not hesitate to say that in our humble opinion the *varied* tenth article of the Augsburg Confession, sets forth the Lutheran

doctrine of the Lord's Supper with more scientific accuracy than the same doctrine is set forth in the *Invariata*. Therefore those who with intelligent conviction and with honest intent, subscribe the *Variata*, by that act confess the historical Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and any preference for or dislike to the *Variata* on the ground that it marks a conscious departure from the historical Lutheran faith, is based upon a lack of intelligence or a lack of candor. Hence it makes no difference whether Calvin, Beza and other Reformed theologians subscribed the *Variata* or the *Invariata*, they nevertheless subscribed that form of sound words which had the approval of Luther, Melancthon, Brentz,\* of the Weimar Confutation-Book and of all Lutherans until in 1560 the *Variata* was first rejected by Flacius, that Ishmael of the Lutheran Church whose hand was against every man. (See *Gieseler*, IV. p. 433, n.)

But the true judgment in regard to Melancthon is expressed by two Lutheran historians of ample information and of acknowledged freedom from *Philippism*: Walch (*Introductio*, p. 194) says: "Since he was led by the character of his mind strongly to desire peace, it is altogether probable that he made the change for the purpose of removing the cause which hindered those who differed from us in the Supper, from embracing our Confession. But it does not follow from this that he so approved the doctrine of the Reformed as to be interested in the propagation of it." And Kurtz, (*Ch. Hist.*, II. p. 136): "He became convinced, not indeed that the Lutheran doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood in the bread and wine was erroneous, but that Calvin's doctrine of a spiritual participation of the body and blood of Christ (through faith) in the Supper, did violence to no essential religious point; therefore he sought to avoid what seemed to him an unessential difference in confession and doctrine." This was undeniably the position of Luther

\*In 1541 Brentz wrote to Veit Theodorus: "I am in the habit of comparing this later edition of the Confession with the former in order to see what is changed, and I find that many things have been changed. But I know that Philip does not change anything rashly and without judgment. Wherefore when I compare and consider the reasons for change, I am wonderfully benefited by the reading." (*Corp. Ref.*, IV. 736).

himself, who sent his salutations to Calvin in 1539; who in the Smaller Confession of 1544 made no reference whatever to Calvin's doctrine; and who in 1545 declared that he could easily have settled the sacramentarian strife with "this pious and learned man." Any other judgment in regard to Melancthon than that expressed by Walch and Kurtz, will brand with double-dyed hypocrisy the immortal author of the *Augustana*, of the *Apology*, of the *Loci*, the man whom Luther loved and cherished and trusted to the last, as he loved and cherished and trusted his own soul. Notwithstanding his soft and yielding temper and his ardent desire for peace, and his dread of the *rabies theologorum*, any judgment or supposition which denies to Melancthon inviolable fidelity and unyielding attachment to fundamental truth, affixes a cruel and outrageous imputation to the memory of one of the purest and best of the sons of God; for in 1557 he subscribed the Smalcald Articles, which contain the strongest and most emphatic confessional statement of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper known during his lifetime; and in 1551 he wrote and subscribed, and again as one of the last acts of his life endorsed, the *Repetition of the Augsburg Confession*, which declares: "In this communion Christ is truly and substantially present, and his body and blood are truly presented to those who commune; *vere et substantialiter adesse Christum, et vere exhiberi summentibus corpus et sanguinem Christi.*" (*Corpus Doctrinae*, p. 270).

But after Melancthon had passed away, two things were discovered: (a) That he had refused to join in open controversy against Calvin, who most unjustly and unrighteously was classed with Carlstadt, Zwingli and Ecolampadius, and stigmatized as a sacramentarian—a mistake and an injustice perpetuated even by the Form of Concord. (b) That he had not emphasized *oral manducation*, nor *sacramental union*, nor the *ubiquity of the body of Christ*, which were brought into prominence and given the chief place by Joachim Westphal and Tillmann Heshusius who with great vehemence spoke of *tearing the flesh of Christ with the teeth*, and declared "that the bread is *substantialiter* the body of Christ; the latter is every where (*Dorner Hist. Prot. Theol.*, I. p.

410. But had Melanchthon followed here the lead of such men as Westphal and Heshusius (see Dorner *ut supra*, Kurtz and Herzog's Real-Encyc. *sub nominibus*), he would not only have exhibited great moral weakness and become *particeps criminis* in an unprovoked and unmerited assault, but he would have departed from the true position of Luther, who, (be it here again emphasized, because of its great importance and because of its capability of the most ample and convincing proof) in all his controversy with the Sacramentarians, laid the chief stress on the *subject-matter* of the Supper, and treated only in a secondary way the relation of Christ to the elements, and who in the various agreements, confessions and concords which he wrote and subscribed, was content always with declaring the *real presence* and *eating and drinking* of the body and blood of Christ, without any attempt to describe the organ, or the mode of reception. Nay more: Any emphasis laid by Melanchthon on these secondary questions would have shown him to be out of harmony with the latest confessional deliverances of the Evangelical churches of Germany; as notably the *Confessio Saxonica* which was prepared to be sent to Trent as exhibiting the doctrines held and taught in Northern Germany; and likewise the *Confessio Württembergica* prepared by Brentz, approved at Wittenberg as agreeing with the *Saxonica*, signed by a commission of ten Swabian divines, and intended also for Trent as the creed of the churches in Southern Germany; for neither of these contains the slightest trace of *oral manducation*, of the *sacramental union*, or of the *ubiquity of the body* of Christ, as long before this, Brentz had expressly denied *oral manducation*, and had not yet seized upon the doctrine of the absolute ubiquity of Christ's body as a basis of agreement in the matter of the Holy Supper. (See *Hase Ch. Hist.*, p. 408; *Schaff, Creeds*, I. p. 344; *Chytracus Hist. Augs. Conf.*)

And in this statement and presentation of the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, both Luther and Melanchthon and the two confessions above named, have been followed, but at a distance, by eminent teachers and preachers of our own day, who have been especially careful to proclaim their zealous and faithful adherence to historical Lutheranism. For instance, Dr.

Seiss in his sermon entitled, "THE LAST SUPPER" (*Lectures on the Gospels, 1871*) has not come up to the statements of either the *Saxonica* or the *Württembergica*; after exhibiting a few glittering generalities from the ancient fathers, which may mean much or little, he has declared his faith in a literal translation (without marks of quotation) of the German of the tenth article of the Augustana, *without the antithesis*, which is exactly the position of the *Variata*.

Dr. Walther in a sermon published in an English translation by the Lutheran Book Store in 1874, goes not one step beyond the language of the earlier Lutheran Confessions, though the distinct proposition which he discusses is "THE IMPORTANCE AND NECESSITY OF ADHERING WITH UNSWERVING FIDELITY TO THE PURE DOCTRINE OF THE LORD'S SUPPER." Neither he nor Dr. Seiss says one word about *oral manducation* or the *sacramental union*, though both subjects come fully within the range of the propositions discussed by each. And Mr. Gerberding, in "THE WAY OF SALVATION IN THE LUTHERAN CHURCH," a book "written for the common people," introduced by a prominent pastor of the General Synod, highly commended by a professor of theology in the Philadelphia Lutheran Seminary, said to be undergoing translation in both German and Swedish,—in this most excellent book "for the common people," Mr. Gerberding contents himself with the words of the Augsburg Confession and Luther's Small Catechism, and says not one word about *oral manducation*, or *sacramental union*. That is, not one of these three distinguished authors and preachers states the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper and of the real presence of Christ in the Supper as strongly and as unmistakably as that doctrine is stated in either the Apology or in the *Saxonica*. This now shows very clearly what is regarded as the Catholic Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and that the predicates and sharp distinctions of the Form of Concord have no practical value for the people; yea, doubtless, that in the estimation of these honored public teachers, these very predicates and sharp distinctions can not even be safely presented to the people. At least they all three publish themselves to the world as saying and declaring that the Lutheran doctrine of the Lord's Supper can be taught

by *withholding* those features of the doctrine which give Chapter VII. of the the Formula its chief characteristics. What then is this but a return to the original position of Luther and Melanchthon, and a practical and therefore real vindication of the latter? For if *oral manducation* and *sacramental union* are to be maintained before synods and conferences, why are they not taught to the people? The Lutheran confessions are the confessions of "our churches." Are not the people to hear the doctrines of "our churches?" If not, why not? If *oral manducation* and *sacramental union* are *important and necessary in adhering with unswerving fidelity to the pure doctrine of the Lord's Supper*, or if they have any practical bearing on *the way of salvation*, why are the people left in blank ignorance in regard to such grave matters? If these doctrines can be so easily and quietly ignored, or if they be held as at least unprofitable, possibly as dangerous to the people, why then should they be made a test of soundness in the faith or a condition of ecclesiastical fellowship? Manifestly there can be no accommodation along this line. Let us then take a new departure, not with Westphal and Heshusius, but with Luther and Melanchthon as our leaders; let us place emphasis where emphasis belongs; let us allow questions which have so long gendered strife to slide into the background. Drs. Seiss and Walther and Rev. Gerberding, whose views of the Lord's Supper (except in so far as Dr. Seiss scarcely comes up to the required standard) we heartily endorse, have shown us the better way,—the way pursued together by Luther and Melanchthon, who were content to affirm the true essential presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Supper, and the reception of the same by the communicant, and desired nothing so much as to be allowed to leave to God all questions of mode and of Christ's relations to the elements.

## ARTICLE V.

## HISTORY AND DOCTRINES OF THE WALDENSIAINS.

Translated and Abridged from the Article of Dr. Emil Comba, in Herzog & Plitt's "Real-Encyklopädie," by THEODORE BENZE, Erie, Penn.

The history of the Waldensians may be divided into three periods :

I. The *period of dissolution* which extends from Valdo to the Reformation.

II. The *period of the schism* which begins with the Reformation and ends with our emancipation.

III. The *period of freedom* which begins with the year 1848 and which embraces the awakening of the Waldensian Church and its missions in Italy until the present day.

I call the latter the period of freedom because we have enjoyed no liberty as Dissenters or Reformed; because this liberty invites us to arise and occupy our place in the light of day; to cast off sectarian prejudices and to maintain the catholicism of all Christians, in opposition to the Vatican sect, convinced that unity comes through liberty according to the words of Vinet: "Through liberty to unity; that shall be the devise of Christianity."

## I. THE PERIOD OF DISSOLUTION.

The beginnings of the Waldensian movement reach back to the time of 1215. During the 13th and 14th centuries it developed further; the time following until the period of the Reformation, is a period of retrogression. The movement had its origin at Lyons, the city of Irenæus, Agobard and Amolo. The city however, does not explain the origination of the Waldensian tendency, for here Catholic superstition held sway over men's minds. In this very city, toward the middle of the 12th century, several monks dared to disseminate the germs of the absurd doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of Mary.

Here, as in Milan and other metropolitan cities of the time, there was room for everything. Lyons was in course of becom-



ing what it has since become, "a city open to all merchants, susceptible to all improvements, corruptions, passion through which nations are inflamed, the ardor of discussion, the insatiable desire of riches and luxury, frivolity, moral degeneracy, fanaticism, religious liberty." (Clerjon). No trace however is found of Cathari, if the silence of the chronicles on this question justifies a conclusion. We only read that one of the merchants whom the city received was named Valdo (Waldus). Whence came he? Of this we know nothing. His name is said to have been Waldez or Valdès according to the oldest Waldensian document. Does this name denote an extraction from a certain place? Where shall we seek it? In the Ager Lugdunensis, in the Dauphiné or even in a district of the Canton de Vaud, where perhaps Henry of Lausanne also was born? Idle conjectures, this the more as this name was not entirely unusual since the time of Charlemagne. Valdo had acquired his riches unjustly, if we may believe the Chron. Laudonensis: "Per iniquitatem foeneris multas sibi pecunias co-acervaverat." Moved by conscience, he began to feel religious wants; we learn that he was "a hearer of the Gospel, and curious to understand what it taught."

Perhaps he already had the intention of divesting himself of his property, when he witnessed a dismaying occurrence, one of his friends falling dead at his side. Impelled by fear, he no longer hesitated to give up his riches. It is further related, that being moved by the story of St. Alexis he determined to think of his salvation and that he went to a theologian, probably a canonicus of St. John, and asked, What must I do to be saved? Which is the surest way—quae via aliis omnibus certior atque perfectior? The doctor replied, quoting Matt. 19: 21, "Si vis esse perfectus, vade et vende omnia quae habes." Valdo complied with this commandment of the Lord without forgetting the one following: "Et da pauperibus et habebis thesaurum in coela, et veni sequere me." We believe that our rich merchant carried out these words to the end, a thing which the monks, who pretended to imitate him, did not do. The Chron. Laudun. everywhere, though alone, affirms the voluntary poverty of Valdo. It reports further, that he divided his possessions

among his wife, his two daughters and the poor, and that when he came to Rome, he was exhorted by Alexander III. who even embraced him, to persist in his vow of poverty; but at the same time, his attention was called to the fact that he could not preach without the consent of the clergy of the city. Richard de Cluni and Stephen of Bourbon especially mention the fact of his reading the Scriptures, translating certain books of the Bible (in which he was aided by two clergymen) and also of his preaching to the people. Here is revealed the real Waldensian standpoint which induced discussion and persecutions. Moreover, it must not be overlooked, that Valdo suffered voluntary poverty, without however, identifying it in mind or practice, with monkish poverty.

An author recently contended that Valdo made begging a duty both for himself and his disciples, while the Cathari renounced all mendicancy. This appears to me to go too far. The Chronicles of Lyons simply say that he had made the vow to possess no property, neither gold nor silver, and, they added, "nor caring for the morrow." He once asked a friend for support. Can that be called begging? George Müller at Bristol carries out great charities by acting on the same principle as here designated, without ever resorting to begging. The original and real Waldensians thought that the laborer of God is worthy of his hire. Their spiritual leaders set aside manual labor, but usually not entirely, so that they could devote themselves wholly to their brethren. We do not see that Valdo "preached mendicancy" nor that his disciples became mendicants. Alanus very appropriately says, the Waldensians "*nullo modo propriis manibus laborare debent, sed ab iis quibus prædicant, recipere necessaria.*" (Should in no wise work with their own hands but receive what they need from those to whom they preach). "*Recipere*" does not signify "demand." But this is not the decisive question. This we find rather in the liberty of proclaiming the Holy Scriptures, as well publicly as privately. I do not believe that Valdo originally had the intention of preaching, in the common acceptation of the word. He wished to employ his liberty to bear witness of that which he had learned to know through the Holy Scriptures. And as this liberty had

not yet been formally constrained he believed he possessed it as a catholic one. This appears from his mode of conduct. He appeals to the Pope in this question, and is not ill received there at first. Moneta, who is our authority that he also went to Rome, writes, that he even received the right to preach, although with the restriction, not to depart from the teachings of the four Fathers of the Latin Church. "He came to the Pope and promised to follow the four Doctors, scil. Ambrose, Augustine, Gregory and Jerome and so received from the Pope the license to preach." Afterwards the Pope repented of this impulse of tolerance, as he foresaw, perhaps better than Valdo, the consequences to which it might lead, and thereupon followed a prohibition, alluded to in the Chron. Laud. and treated more in detail by Mapes. The latter reports, that at a council held at Rome by Alexander III. (1179) several Waldensians appeared who requested that the right to preach be confirmed to them, ("multa petebant instantia praedicationis auctoritatem sibi confirmare.") It is known that they were objects of the ridicule of the prelates because they did not know the meaning of the scholastic term "credere in." (See Hagenbach Dogmengeschichte, §186). Moreover, the right to preach was withdrawn from them, and all manner of preaching forbidden. Besides, the scoffing of the prelates did not hinder them from regarding themselves as menaced. But the Council did not yet excommunicate them. As Neander remarks, it was their intention to see whether Valdo and his disciples would not submit. But they did not submit, and, as they were already in conflict with the Bishop of Lyons who had forbidden them to preach, they were driven from his diocese and by a later Council were condemned as schismatics. Dieckhoff has in vain contended, that the question is here concerning a Council which was held in 1212 in Rome, before the great Lateran Council.

The anathema was not long delayed. It was proclaimed at Verona, at the Council convened under the presidency of Pope Lucius III. in 1183-1184. It denounced heretics in general and in particular "eos qui se Humiliatos vel Pauperes de Lugduno falso nomine mentiuntur," (those who under a false name pass as Humiliati or Poor of Lyons), and passed sentence upon them

in the following words: "And since some under pretext of piety, denying its virtue according to what the apostle says, assume to themselves the authority of preaching when the same apostle says, 'How shall they preach, unless they are sent,' we bind with equal bond of perpetual anathema, all who publicly or privately shall presume to preach when prohibited or not sent, except with authority derived from the apostolic seat or from the bishop of the place." (Decretum, ap. d'Argentré). While they were condemned at Verona, the disciples of Valdo spread further and further into the provinces in the vicinity of the Diocese of Lyons where their way was prepared by the Cathari, and everywhere their adherents increased in number. As they always considered themselves good Catholics, it was hoped they could yet be overcome. The Chronicles mention the disputation which took place at Narbonne in the year 1190. This record is characteristic; in it we find the original Waldensian assertion which may be thus stated; the *Universal Priesthood of the Sermon*, without any ecclesiastical discrimination, not even that of sex. (Prædicant omnes passim et sine delectu conditionis, ætatis vel sexus.) Their duty is: "Ab omni qui scit verbum Dei in populis seminare, prædicandum esse." (Every one who knows how to disseminate the word of God among the people should preach.) The proof of this assertion was based on James 4: 17; Mark 9: 38 seq.; Phil. 1: 15 seqq. For the preaching of women they referred to Titus 2: 2 seq. Their protest, which was more than once reiterated, may be stated in the words of the apostle Peter: "We ought to obey God rather than men." This is the principle of the liberty of laymen as far as concerns the reading and interpretation of Holy Writ which the council could not cease to condemn. Thus, at Toulouse in 1229, and at Tarracona in 1234. As polypes around a rock, so around this nucleus subsequently clung new principles, as well of a dogmatic nature, (the denial of purgatory, of intercession for the dead, of the mediation of saints), as of a moral nature (the limitation of the vow of celibacy, rejection of the oath) and of an ecclesiastical nature (a certain independence in worship, discipline of the ministry and regulation

of pastoral activity). Some of these principles had their source in the original one, others in the current of ecclesiastical opposition, whether they were Catharistic, Arnoldic, Wickliffian or Hussitic. The first is the life-principle of the Waldensian tendency; the principle which has caused their opposition to the Church and which justifies it. Certainly also, the vow of poverty must be taken into consideration, as well as the common condition of affairs of the time, if we would correctly judge the whole movement. If, moreover, the vow of poverty be the pedestal, then the universal priesthood is the statue erected upon it.

The Waldensians, once condemned, learned by experience that, if they were Catholic, they were not so in the sense of Rome. They had to choose between peace and resistance. But to withstand the Pope, an Innocent III., the veritable Jupiter thundering from the Roman Olympus, they needed a strength of conviction which not all of them possessed. A separation became unavoidable, and doubtless aided the Waldensian cause. I allude to the disputation at Paniers in 1207, and the separation which took place in the ranks of the Waldensians.

This disputation took place between the Bishop of Osma and several other Romish clergymen on the one side, and several Waldensians on the other. Influenced by this discussion, a cer-Durand d'Osca, after having for some time been allied to the Waldensian movement, returned to the bosom of the Church. Still he did not wish to give up the vow of poverty. For this purpose he applied to Innocent III. in 1209 and his poverty was allowed him on condition of obedience to the Pope. In this manner was formed the small brotherhood of *Pauperes Catholici*, which hardly survived its founder. That was not yet a "glorious return!" Durand went to Milan and promised the Pope to bring back into the Church about one hundred Waldensians if they were promised a place of meeting. Innocent III. does not seem to have opposed this in the beginning. What came of it? We can not say. Another similar brotherhood was formed under the direction of a certain Bernardus, called Primus. They surrendered, arms and baggage, in the camp of Rome. This desertion, which was directed more

by priests than by laymen, was well suited to the spirit of the times, for the storm which had been threatened by the decision of Verona, began to rage and orders of persecution had already been given. Alphonse of Arragon, Marquis of Provence, also published in 1194 an edict against the Waldensians. It was confirmed, two years later, by his successor. In the year 1209 appeared an edict of the Emperor Otto, in reply to the complaint of Jacob of Caristo, Bishop of Turin, against the Waldensians. (*Praesertim tibi auctoritate mandamus, quatenus hereticos Valdenses et omnes qui in Taurinensis diocesi zizaniam seminant falsitatis et fidem catholicam alicujus erroris seu pravitatis doctrina impugnant, a toto Taurinensi episcopatu imperiale auctoritate expellas.* This edict has by mistake been dated sixteen years earlier by Monastier whom Herzog follows.)

In the same year began to rumble the frightful thunderstorm which Innocent III. let loose over the south of France, the bloody crusade against the Albigenses, which was to crush the hopes of the Cathari and to scatter the Waldensians. In the year 1215 a new sentence of condemnation was published by the Lateran Council and was followed by new thunderbolts. Dieckhoff very correctly remarks that then ended the period of the beginnings of the movement started by Valdo. The persecution continued, and on a thousand paths brought the Waldensians to a new stage of development.

Let us follow the Waldensians in their Diaspora. Some spread toward the west, where since 1192, their traces are found in the diocese of Toul, where they received the name of Wadoys; according to Blair, they also came to Aquitaine, Guyenne and Gascogne. Then, during the British invasion, a small band crossed the Canal de la Manche and were well received in the county of Kent; others are said to have gone into the countries along the Rhine, and perhaps united afterwards with the Lollhards. Others moved towards the north and north-east. They had a center at Metz. ("In urbe Metensi pullulante secta, quae dicitur Waldensium" as we read in a chronicle of the year 1199). There they read and commented upon books of Scripture and Innocent III. interfered directly in so much that he caused an investigation to be held. As the Waldensians sometimes min-

gled with the brethren of the "Free Spirit," or were sometimes induced to conceal their name, it is difficult to say where they have not been. We meet them in Alsace, beginning at Strasburg; along the banks of the Rhine, as well in Germany as in the Netherlands. Later researches have multiplied the places of refuge and dwelling already known. So the labors of Dr. Herman Haupt who brought to light new proofs of the appearance of the Waldensians at Würzburg, Nürnberg, Bamberg, &c. (Haupt: *Die religiösen Sekten in Franken vor der Reformation*). He has, besides, thrown much light on the relations between the Waldensians and Hussites. We can estimate now, especially after the successful investigations of Prof. Loserth (Huss und Wicliff) the decisive influence Wicliffe exerted over the convictions of Huss, and Huss over those of the Hussites. The relations of the Waldensians make it apparent, that this influence also exerted itself in the Waldensian literature. I can add nothing to what has been told by men as Herzog (Waldenser III), Zegschwitz, (*Die Katechismen der Waldenser und der böhmischen Brüder*), Palacky (*Ueber die Beziehungen und das Verhältniss der Waldenser zu den ehemaligen Sekten in Böhmen*), all of whom ought to be compared with Preger (*Beiträge zur Geschichte der Waldensier aus den Abhandlungen der königl.-baier. Akademie*) and Keller. The treatise of Preger discloses the teachings of the Waldensians who had settled in Austria, and the importance of the spreading of the Waldensians in the diocese of Passau where they numbered no less than 42 communities. Herzog alludes to the appearance of the Waldensians in Switzerland toward the end of the 14th century, as well at Bern as at Freiburg. Ochsenbein has now published copious notes on the trial of the year 1399 and on a still more important trial of the year 1430, which concerned the Waldensians of Freiburg. We confess, that the more light there is shed on the dissenters and heretics of Freiburg, the less are we inclined to recognize them as real Waldensians. According to a manuscript discovered by Preger at Munich, and which he published in his "*Beiträge*," we know that a Colloquium assembled representatives of the Waldensians living beyond the mountains (*Oltramontani*) or Poor of Lyons on the one side, and of



the *Pauperes Italici* or Lombards on the other, at Bergamo, in May 1218. They here treated of the points by which they were held apart, especially of the conditions of the legitimacy of the priesthood, of the sacraments of baptism, the holy communion, and kindred subjects. There is no doubt but that these *Pauperes Italici* had Arnoldic blood in their veins. If in the thirteenth century, Alanus and other Catholic writers assign to the Waldensians in general, the opinion that the ministerial validity of a priest's functions depended on the moral worth of the one performing them, we must seek the reason with the "*Pauperes Italici*" who, in this point, were the heirs of the views of Arnold of Brescia. Both sides acknowledged belief in Transubstantiation; but according to the Poor of Lyons it is the effect of the word of God that causes it, while according to the Lombards it is not possible without the personal righteousness of the one administering. The views of the Lombards caused a much greater independence in the opposition to the Roman clergy.

Let us follow the Waldensians into the valleys of the Alps, where they found a refuge from persecution. We can understand that they spread into the Dauphiné, all of Provence, the valleys of the Hautes-Alpes, whither the schism had spread since the time of Peter de Bruys and had perhaps originated in the valley Loyse, once called Vallis Gyrontana. But what attracted them in the Hither Alps, the valleys of Italy? It has been attempted to prove the existence of a dissenting population in these valleys, in order to explain the spread thither. It has been added, that Valdo himself had come thither to raise the banner for his disciples. But these are conjectures. If this, especially the first point, could be proved, all were said; but we find no historical evidence. We have in vain searched for these evidences, in the memoirs of de Luserna, from whom we have the somewhat modified motto, "*Lux lucet in tenebris.*" The documents relating to the founding of the Abbey of Pignerol also mention nothing of it. But not even this question is necessary in order to understand three things: *First*, that as Gilles says, our emigrants had to find people who were "not far distant from their faith, especially if we consider that they themselves had not departed widely from the creed of the Catholic Church."

*Secondly*, that they did not fail to till the land in the unoccupied regions and that de Luserna had an interest in this cultivation. *Finally*, that they made a virtue of necessity, as the persecution at last dispersed them. The time was not at all unfavorable for immigration. Thomas, the first Count of Savoy, was under guardianship, or rather, he was on the point of going to war, accompanied by de Luserna and de Piorrosque. So we are informed by a treatise in the library of Victor Emmanuel at Turin, entitled "*Histoire veritable des Vaudois.*" (The fragment relating hereto may be found in my essay "*Valdo ed i Valdesi.*") We can also compare Ughelli, "*Italia Sacra.*" He says, that Angrogne at this time was a part of the Dauphiné. It is a fact, that the first mention which is made of the Waldensians this side of the Alps is the one found in the edict of Otto IV., which was published during his sojourn in Italy in the year 1209. If their arrival was alarming, as Ughelli thinks, we can the better comprehend the haste of the Bishop of Turin to get the decree; but this presumption is not necessary.

But were all the fugitives who settled in these valleys Waldensians? We doubt it, and for this reason. It is a fact that the common fate allied the persecuted with the Cathari against Rome. They already divided the land between them and at times were, so to speak, one and the same family. For example, the wife and the sister of the Count de Foix, lord of the castle of Pamiers, where the first disputation took place, had been received among the Waldensians, while a second sister had joined the Cathari. What is more natural than the mingling of these two sects in their flight over the Alps? Is it not absolutely necessary to presume this intermingling in order to understand the traces of the spread of the Cathari in the plains of Piedmont? We find them afterwards not only in the plain, but in the very valleys of the Waldensians, where like many of the Waldensians they also bear French names. This appears from the records of several law-suits of the Inquisition. But however this may be, the Waldensian point of view was the ruling one among the fugitives.

The population grew to such an extent, that it became necessary to spread further. Towards the year 1332 it is reported

that the assemblies of the Waldensians numbered as high as 500 members "per modum capituli." If this was a case of synods, the lay element must have been largely represented and delegates had to come from either side the Alps. According to a computation which may be considered exact, the population which had gathered within the limits of the Cottian Alps, in the diocese of Turin and Embrun, numbered about 50,000. The next emigration created a flourishing colony in Calabria. The historian who narrates this, speaks of uninterrupted connections between the bee-hive in the Alps and the swarm in the south of Italy. They have not been sufficiently cleared up. Likewise, we do not see that we can accept the fact upon positive indications that the Waldensian community was the possessor of houses from which the mission was conducted in the larger cities. We believe that a confusion may have been made with what is said of the Cathari and other sects, in case we do not accede to the views of Dr. Keller, according to whom the Waldensians strove to imitate the Brethren of the Free Spirit, and in connection with them built houses of refuge as a means of making proselytes. It is a fact, that the *Pauperes Lombardi* stopped here, and we only wish that the notes furnished by Gilles for a period of three centuries were better confirmed and less contested.

But let us return to the Cottian Alps and report in a few words on the condition of the populace which from now on formed the center of the Waldensian community. At the same time we shall comprehensively state what may be said of their discipline and their writings.

The Waldensians had hardly settled in the Alpine valleys, before they became subject to oppressive legislation. We have alluded to the decree of Otto IV. of the year 1209. Eleven years later, the authorities of Pinerolo, a little town situated near the terminus of the valleys of Perosa and Luserna, published the following edict: It has been decreed, that if any man or any woman entertains any Waldensian, male or female, having a knowledge of it, shall, within the jurisdiction of Pinerolo, pay a fine of ten solidi, as often as he or she shall entertain. It has been computed, that these ten solidi would to-day have a value

of about 280 francs. However, there are no indications of a bloody persecution on this side the Alps, before the end of the thirteenth century. Still, we can not say, with Léger, that this respite lasted several hundred years. He probably thinks of the time before Waldo, when the Waldensians did not yet exist. In the year 1297 the persecution was again begun in the valley of Perosa. We find in the state archives of Turin a patent of appointment of the year 1301, which had been granted to Stefano d'Argentario of Bergamo to remain at Perosa in the quality of an Inquisitor, and he was given full power to arrest the heretics of every sect condemned by the Church of Rome. These patents were no dead letter. In the year 1312 a Waldensian was burned to death at Perosa, (Hahn. *Geschichte der Ketzer im Mittelalter.*) In the year 1354, the Prince of Achaie published decrees of persecution against the heretics of the valley of Luserna, which Monastier confirms, but they do not seem to have been very efficient. The heretics, on the other hand, began to retaliate, *e. g.* at Susa, in the year 1375 when the Dominican Convent was attacked and the Inquisitor killed; and at Angrogne in the year 1332. It is difficult in these retaliations to determine the share of the Waldensians and of the Cathari. They have equal share. The Inquisitor Borelli perpetrated a cruel revenge for this, about Christmas 1400, when he surprised the Waldensians of Pragelas; 50 to 80 children, naming but one incident, who had been carried by their parents in the flight over the mountains, died from the cold. A Catholic priest, Vincenzo Ferreri had visited the valleys in the year 1403 and now called the attention of the persecutors to them. He reports that Garari or Cathari and Waldensians had intermingled, that they formed *scholæ distinctæ*, congregations of a certain kind, and that for thirty years no catechist of the Church of Rome had been there. He boasts of having here converted several inhabitants. The bloody atrocities committed in the year 1475 by the Duchess Iolanthe, through the agency of the Nuntio Albert de Capitaneis, and upon instigation of Innocent VIII., are but too well known. Her example was followed in the year 1500 by the Marchioness of Saluzzo. So much concerning the Waldensians in the valleys of Italy.

On the French side they were fiercely persecuted. We read that Benedict XII. ordered the bishops of Valence and Vienne to expel them, after the persecutions had already put to death numerous victims. According to what Camerarius relates of the Waldensian fugitives of the valleys of Piemont and Provence, they were for a while protected by the municipal authorities and then, on instigation of Gregory IX. were furiously persecuted, several of them being burnt to death. It seems that the survivors then enjoyed a period of comparative quiet, which lasted about 20 years. Towards 1400, however, came the Franciscan monk Borelli, of dark renown. He imprisoned many, and several were committed to the flames. Afterwards, the inhabitants of the valleys Loyse, Fraisière and Argentié appealed to the protection of Louis XII., who, convinced that this was not a matter of heretics separated from the Church, promised them his protection in a decree dated at Arras, May 18th, 1478. But the decree contained one restriction: "Unless, however, there were some, who wished obstinately and with hardened courage, to maintain and affirm anything against the holy Catholic faith." This restriction had a certain validity and the inquisitors knew how to make use of it. (Herzog, *Die romanischen Waldenser*). Towards the end of the century, the persecution was on the point of taking still greater proportions; but thanks to the intervention of Louis XII. it was restricted by a decree published Oct. 12th, 1502, at Lyons, and Pope Alexander VI. must have found some advantage in it, although he was the same who had executed the Reformer of Florence, for he assented and gave to this decree his priestly sanction.

In this epoch the diminution of the Waldensians had already begun. It continued until the time of the Reformation. This has been confirmed by the most various researches, including those on the Moravians in the year 1497 and 1498 (Camerarius), and those of Claudius Seyssel, Bishop of Turin. This, however, by no means hinders us from presuming their presence in several cities of Piemont.

The opposition itself, however, was not suppressed. What explains its duration and the restoration itself? It is the doc-

trine of the Waldensians, in considering which we must also bear in mind their ethical principles and maxims, and their very manner of opposition to Rome.

For a foundation the Bible was sufficient, for we must not assign too great importance to the glosses of the Fathers which they sought to combine with it. If anything characterizes them, it is the definite purpose not to break with Catholic tradition. It is indeed not difficult to determine the chief points of their opposition which began with the continued reading of Scripture and its free interpretation. If they rejected Purgatory, they could in so doing, employ the words of Gregory the Great and of Jerome; if they made the validity of ministerial functions dependent upon the moral worth of the priest, they seem to follow the impulse also given by Gregory and by Ambrose and Bernard; although in fact it was a direct consequence of the Arnoldic movement. If they did not wish to swear, they acted like Isidore; if they preferred to seek absolution only with God, they had for this a rich selection of sentences of the Fathers; but it was the Bible that gave authority to all of these; it is sufficient as rule and criterion. Although they did not reject every Symbol or Confession, yet they laid chief stress upon the Sermon on the Mount. This was their code, although it is not necessary to see in this an approach to the old *Διδαχῆς*. But there is no doubt that after the persecution had once been begun, the Waldensians made an approach to the other dissenters and even to the more direct opponents of the Catholic Church, as, *e. g.* the Cathari, from whom they derived more than one decisive impulse. Herzog and Ochsenein, as well as others, have sufficiently demonstrated the influence of the Cathari; Tocco has also tried to prove the same; but, as appears to me, in a somewhat exaggerating manner. For, after all, the Waldensian dogmas remained Catholic, with the exception of one or two points. It can easily be seen, that upon the denial of Purgatory, other assertions had to follow logically and immediately, especially those on the value of intercession for the dead, on mass and on the adoration of saints. It can not be doubted, that, as we have already stated, the idea of a universal priesthood, which was moreover strengthened by the assertion of

the moral worth of the one officiating, was necessarily followed by a certain independence in the observances of ecclesiastical ceremonies. Their literally evangelical system of ethics, like the dogma, is tainted with the characteristic heresies of the Cathari; their writings, of which we shall soon treat, contain no less traces of such an influence. If the Waldensians rejected mendicancy, the oath, the recognition of the "*jus gladii*," etc., they have undoubtedly been led by Catharistic influences; but they have still less departed from the Sermon on the Mount, which they would only apply according to its letter. As far as concerns certain forms, the influence of the Cathari plainly appears, although there can be no question of similarity. So, *e. g.* from the very start, the Waldensians extended the universal priesthood to the female sex, also the right of free preaching of the Word, which the Cathari did not do. Nor did they have a common rite, inasmuch as the Cathari did not even observe the sacrament of Baptism, nor of the Altar. They approach each other in discipline and Church government. It must emphatically be accepted, that the Waldensians had a triple division of offices: deacons, presbyters and bishops, except in the valleys of Piemont where we also find a Barbe majoralis assisted by a coadjutor or two. It is true that everything here depends upon the definition which we give to these titles. They were no bishops in the modern sense of the word. Not even does the "Stefen" (Etienne), of whom the Moravians received the valid ordination, seem to have been an exception. He reminds me of a saying I heard in Herrenhut: "The bishop is a man who can ordain." In short, the difference between "*episcopi*" and "*presbyteri*" seems then to have been no larger than in the early days of which Jerome speaks. The Waldensians at times probably also received the distinction between "*perfecti*" and "*credentes*." I will not go into further details, for the Waldensian doctrine has been sufficiently treated of by Herzog, Cunitz and Keller, so that this may be refrained from. I will only remark that for the understanding of the form of their doctrine, which dates from the final condemnation of the Waldensians, it is important to take into account the sequence of the chronicles which give information concerning them, also the places where Waldensians



are found. Moreover, the more we test the old assertions, those of an Alanus, Rainerio Sacconi, David of Augsburg, Moneta and other Dominicans, a testimony to which we must, before all, add that of Limborch, the more we must be convinced of their inner worth. They are testimonies in the literal sense of the word; they confirm the chief points, and this confirmation coincides with what may be found in the Waldensian writings of the first period as Herzog has proved in his two treatises: "*De origine et pristino statu Waldens. sect. antiq., eorum scripta cum libris Catholicorum ejusdem aevi collata*" and "*die romanischen Waldenser.*" What more do we need, to conclude with him, that the biblical opposition of the original Waldensians did not disjoin itself from Catholic dogmatics, which it otherwise much neglected. It is spirited opposition but does not aim at a real schism; its polemics turn against the management, against the system prevalent in the Church, and against the secularization which had taken hold of it; but not against the Roman Catholic Church as a whole. It is not until the Reformation that the Gordian knot of the schism is cut through.

## II. THE PERIOD OF SCHISM.

In this period we distinguish three phases: that of the regeneration of the Waldensians through the Reformation; that of the heroic struggle for existence; that of the decadence, which came immediately before the present period of our liberty.

In the beginning it will be necessary to depict the religious, moral and ecclesiastical condition of the Waldensians when the Reformation dawned. They themselves have furnished us with all the information that could possibly be wished for on the subject. Indeed they seriously endeavored to come to meet the movement of reform, to consult with several of the best known and nearer leaders of the movement to reveal to them, with touching modesty, the decadence of their fellowship as Herzog relates in detail in his "*Romansche Waldenser.*" Waldensian manuscripts having a bearing on the subject, were published by him, and in such a manner, that light has now been shed on this subject and we know what to think of the time of the compilation of the catechism, which Perrin and Leger date

back to the beginning of the twelfth century. The Reformers gave the directions, la nobla Leiczon of the Reformation. (The documents hereto appertaining have become known through the exertions of Herzog). To the Waldensians nothing remained but to come to a decision concerning them. Accordingly, a synod was agreed upon, which, in September, 1532, met in the village of Chanforans in the valley of Angrogne. Farel and Saunier here determined the issue. The resolutions of this synod, alluded to superficially by Perrin, more reliably by Gilles, have been brought to light by Herzog from the Waldensian manuscripts at Dublin and published by him (Roman. Waldenser), and corrected by Dr. Benrat (*Rivista Cristiana* 1876). They were adopted unanimously. The doctrine of predestination was the one which especially confused some. Two pastors, Waldensians from France, left their homes and went to Bohemia to apply for the assistance of their brethren. But here their conduct was such that they disturbed the Church of the Valleys as much as the Bohemian Brotherhood. At the synod which met in the valley St. Martin, 1533, they definitely acceded to the doctrine of the Reformation. It is not meant, that they determined to separate from the Catholic Church; but that was a natural consequence, neither the Catholics nor the Reformed having a doubt of it. The persecutions, which however were foreseen, prove this conclusively, also their open protection by Protestant nations.

Now it became necessary to carry out the intended reformation. One of the principal means towards the accomplishment of this object, was the translation of the Bible. This, which gives us light on the early history of the Waldensian Church, will also give us an explanation of the Waldensian regeneration through the Reformation. It is known that the work of translation was entrusted to Robert Olivetan, a relative of Calvin, and known in the Waldensian valleys, where his office and his knowledge of Holy Scripture were highly respected. The value of Olivetan's translation, especially that of the Old Testament, was restored to acknowledgment by Reuss. It is also known that the Waldensian population subjected itself to a heavy tax in order to defray the expenses of the translation. They

began, through the agency of their ministers, to get acquainted with Reformed (Calv.) doctrines. The books of the Reformers now and then were carried among them by colporteurs. The Reformation was soon carried out in the valleys of France in the Provence, where the number of schismatic Waldensians soon increased to several thousand. In the year 1535, they presented a confession of faith to their king, Francis I. Ten years later, the persecutions pounced upon the revived congregations like a lamb's-vulture of the Alps upon light prey; more than twenty villages were burned down, and the inhabitants slain by thousands. The survivors, about 4000, sought refuge in the higher Alps. The persecutions were renewed in the year 1560, but did not last long. The valleys lying towards Italy, and which after the treaty of Crespy stood under the sovereignty of France, saw the Reformation enter more slowly. Public preaching of the Gospel did not begin until 1555, the year of the foundation of our first churches (temples). In the same year, the French colporteur Barthélemy Hector was burnt to death at Turin; in 1557 the Barbe Goffredo Varugalia, a born Catholic and before, when a monk, efficient in the conversion of heretics, suffered punishment by death. During the reign of Emmanuel Philibert, the valleys of Italy were restored to the rule of the house of Savoy, in accordance with the treaty of Chateau-Cambresis. As early as the year 1560, the demand was put to the Waldensians, to accept Catholic priests. After they had presented a petition in which they prayed to be allowed to remain in the faith of their fathers, the attempt was made to convert them by force, and blood flowed in streams! Thereupon the Waldensians tried to make an armed resistance; but in vain. In 1561, in compliance with the treaty of Cavour, they were granted some toleration, but under grave conditions. Still, even this toleration was a deceit, as it did not hinder new oppressions from threatening the Waldensians; wherefore they entered into an alliance called "L'union des Vallées" (the union of the Valleys) and which had for its object to preserve faithfully the creed of the Reformation. A confession of faith was framed after the "Confessio Gallicana" in 1559 and published by Antoine Leger at Geneva. In 1662 it was followed by one in Italian.

The colony of Calabrians who had also joined the Reformation, applied for ministers. Etienne Negrin and Louis Pascal were sent to them. Now followed the persecutions which led to their utter extermination and which Crespin relates in detail in his "Histoire des Martyrs." The tragic fate of the colony has even in our days found an echo in the writings of an ex-priest, a member of the Italian chamber of deputies, Filippo de Boni, by name, (*L'Inquisizione ed i Calabro Valdesi*), who drew from the archives an interesting history of the martyrs; and of Alexandre Lombard of Geneva, a descendant of Italians who emigrated in those days. A Waldensian evangelist, two years ago visited the places once inhabited by the colony and ascertained that the memory of the fathers has not been altogether extinguished; a sympathy for the "brethren from Piemont" could be remarked from certain indications, among others, from this that they still understood the dialect of the valley of Angrogne, in which the evangelist conversed with them; and from the hearty welcome which was given him; but we must guard against seeing in this an indication of their approaching return to the evangetic faith.

We see from these facts, that it cost the Waldensians some effort to follow the Reformation and break with the Church of Rome. But this was only a prelude to the more and more atrocious persecutions which were to follow and which mark the "heroic age." Yet we can not here pretend to relate them all. Besides, this part is the best known of Waldensian history and has been told in prose and verse in all languages. With Herzog we will only confine ourselves to the following remarks: "The plague of the year 1630 had swept off almost one half of the population and almost all of the pastors, (there being but two left in the valleys of Italy); the consequence was, that strangers had to be called and the Italian language suspended from public worship, and that of the new pastors, namely the French, was adopted. From this period dates the alteration of the forms of worship to the manner of the Swiss Reformed. The "Barbe" became a "Monsieur" (Sir; Herr); discipline grew lax, and was made light for the sake of the strangers; by means of special treasures, it was made possible for young men, especially fitted for and inclined to the work, to enter the ministry. Mention of

these facts can be found in the archives of the Universities of Geneva and Basel. As we have already stated, the period of the great persecutions is also that of heroic defence. It was not only heroic in this, that the original patience of the ancient Waldensians again appeared; but deserves the designation as heroic from another point of view; their reserved manner of defending themselves, had, under the influence of the Reformation, made way for another principle and the Waldensian Church visibly became a church militant. The "struggle for existence" shaped characters, and a few of them are worthy of being named among the greatest the world admires. Among them we find a Janavel, an Arnaud. The most atrocious and most ill-famed persecution was the one of the year 1655. The alarm given by Prefect Leger roused an echo in all of Europe, and the solidarity of our brethren of the faith found expression in the threats of Cromwell, who spoke of attacking the Duchy of Savoy with his fleet, as well as in the aid rendered us by his government and that of other countries. But the time of the severest crisis for the Waldensians certainly is the time of their forced "Exodus" in the year 1686-87. Who has not read of it? And who has not read the narrative of the "glorious return" (*la glorieuse rentrée*) in the year 1689, the plan of which was the work of old Janavel and the execution of it, the deed of old Arnaud? This return somewhat resembles the Anabasis of the 10,000, except in this, that it is no retreat but a victory, and besides, one of such high order that Napoleon spoke of it with admiration. Preparations are being made in the Waldensian valleys to celebrate, with justifiable pride, the two-hundredth anniversary of this great event by which our fatherland was restored to us. The citizenship was then bought with the blood of the best of us and we shall firmly hold it. One of the most noted writers of the Italian press, has pronounced, in the following words, the unanimous sentiments of all in Italy who confess to a patriotic liberalism: "Thanks should be given you publicly by all Italy, oh Waldensians, as you have never wished to hate and scorn your ancient mother, until the glorious day when your constancy has been crowned by God, and a mutual pact of liberty reconciles you with the emended persecution." (Ter.

Mamiani.) But let us not anticipate the order of things. We are still far distant from the feasts of liberty to which these noble words allude; we are still filled with the terrors of the persecution. Not all of the exiled Waldensians returned, and some of those who had returned, among them their leader Arnaud, nine years later were again compelled to take the exile's staff; and the parishes of Schönberg, Gross-Villars, Pinach, New-Hengsted, &c., in the kingdom of Würtemberg, where our dialect is still spoken, testify in some degree, to the vitality of our Waldensian traditions. Pastor Arnaud ended his days at Schönberg in 1721. Other exiles settled in Kur-Brandenburg.

But let us return to the Waldensians in the valley of the Alps. Toward the end of the 18th century, their condition was still quite miserable, as may be seen from an address by Pastor Appia to the Austrian general Neipperg, in 1799. In the mean time the chant of liberty was heard at Paris, during the days of the Revolution. Napoleon took an interest in their fate, restored their synods and granted salaries to their pastors. At his fall, the hopes which had been roused also disappeared and the wind blew, if not towards persecution, yet towards oppression during the reign of Victor Emmanuel I., Charles Felix and even of Charles Albert.

The church system of the Waldensians is that of the Reformed churches, namely the presbyterial system. Only the colloquies (local consistories) have ceased, first in Switzerland, and and finally also in France. The administration is vested in a so called Table (*la table*) corresponding to the Board of the English, and which consists of five members. The president is called *Moderateur*. When the Synod meets his office ceases, and the Synod elects its own president.

### III. THE PERIOD OF FREEDOM.

This period does not yet number forty years, but freedom gives it a value that cannot be underrated. Here we need not try to discriminate between distinct, consecutive phases, but we will try to preserve a certain order which will allow us to divide this period into sections. King Charles Albert, in the begin-

ning of his reign gave no reason to anticipate the liberty which marks the end of the reign. Surrounded by Jesuits, he seemed to be their tool. But the current of public opinion fostered the freedom of Italy. The liberal party was founded in Piedmont by such men as Balbi, Gioberti, Cavour, the brothers de'Azeglio, Broffiero, etc. It was spread over all of Italy by Mazzini, his "Giovine Italia," Guerazzi, Montanelli. The liberal movement was victorious in 1848; four free constitutions were framed, namely at Rome, Naples, Florence and Turin. That of Piedmont alone remained; religious tolerance, which by it had been upheld, here found its direct and practical application. The Waldensians undertook to give it a meaning, and Cavour, who from the beginning had been the leader of the liberal tendency, foresaw that the exercise of religious liberty would also be a good foundation for general liberty. But the Waldensians do not forget, that Roberto d'Azeglio made the religious and civic emancipation of the Waldensians a matter of his private concern, which is but confirmed by the recent publication of his correspondence. The Edict of Emancipation signed by Charles Albert has the date of Feb. 17, 1848. I refrain from describing the feasts given in honor of it; the most enthusiastic welcome was given to the Waldensians at Turin, when they appeared to thank their Prince. As to the rest, the edict did not speak of freedom in the proper sense of the word, but of "tolerance which is in accordance with the laws," adding: "No innovation has been made so far as concerns the exercise of their worship." That was a restriction, "an unfortunate restriction," as our *Moderateur* said at the time. Woe to the Waldensians if they had not put to use the auspicious moment! woe to them, if they had misused it! They were to contribute to the fulfillment of the vocation which Piedmont had, that Piedmont of which G. Massari wrote: "The fate of Italy depends on Piedmont; on this point agree the hopes and desires of all Italiana, for power is there." But God who had previously prepared the day of our liberty put it into the hearts of several persons also to prepare his little people for it. The torch of faith, which had almost been extinguished through indifference, again blazed out, after the visit of Felix Neff and the faithful, almost puritan testi-



mony of Antoine Blanco and other Waldensian pastors, such as Joshua Meiller. Antoino Blanco for several years kept up in the midst of the Waldensian Church a kind of separate union similar to that of the first Waldensians in their relation to the Catholic Church, or that of Spener in the Lutheran Church. This union afterwards widened and from it many good examples took their initiative, such as ardor for the missionary work and other reforms. But it must also be remarked, that for the same reason a sectarian spirit grew up; the missionaries of Darbism and other *isms* are ready to awaken it and to profit by it. Among these humble benefactors we must reckon Filly, Beckwith and Stewart, who have brought the help of the word, faith, and Christian benevolence. Through their labors we have come into possession of the schools which are necessary for the generation that to-day bears the responsibility for the missionary work of the church. After the schools came the churches of the Waldensians at Turin and from Turin down to Sicily.

Protestantism was already represented by several confessions when the Waldensian mission began. The Prussian ambassador, Baron Walburg-Truchsess, upon the authorization of Frederick William III, had founded a chapel for Protestant worship at Turin. His ministers were successively, J. P. Bonjour, Amédée Bert, (Waldensianer). To the same monarch we are indebted among other deeds of benevolence for the founding of a scholarship at Berlin, for Waldensian students. When Baron Truchsess was at Toskana, he had a chapel opened there in 1826. A chapel was likewise erected at Rome in 1819, thanks to the ambassador, the historian, Niebuhr. The German congregation at Venice had an early origin, but did not obtain its present chapel until 1813. The congregation at Livorno, German and Dutch at the same time, exists since 1807; the one at Bergamo, composed of the most different elements, since the same year; those at Naples, both the German and the French, since 1825; the one at Genoa since 1826. In several cities there are also churches of the Anglican confession; but this church, according to its old custom takes a separatistic stand; it has a diocese of the Mediterranean with the episcopal seat at Gibraltar and keeps up a little missionary station at Malta and publishes a little periodical in the

Italian language, called "l'Indicatore." Dr. Stewart in 1844 founded at Livorno the first station of the Scotch Liberal Church which now has a Colloque or Presbytery in Italy and chapels at Rome, Naples, Florence, Genoa and Malta. As a rule, these congregations are not interested in the Waldensian missionary work; their pastors are less indifferent; with a very slight exception they all favor it.

Let us return to the Church of the Valleys, to view its missions. We ask, "Was this work legitimate, desirable?"

The question seems difficult, but is not so. The facts reply to our questions in the affirmative, for a reformation of the Catholic Church is not to be expected. The experience of Savonarola, that a reformation is impossible, unless independent of the Papacy, still holds good in our day. The political weather-cock Pius IX., now leaning towards liberalism, now a slave of the Jesuitical reaction, the self-deceptions of Abbate Gisberti, Abbate Lambruschini, and of all others, reveal what folly it would be to depend on such a change, and this is exactly the experience the High-Church Anglicans had in the Old-Catholic movement. That which serves to justify the evangelic mission is, that *it alone is possible*. Moreover, if the Waldensian Church has a vocation, tried by the constancy of centuries, and possesses a recognition derived from the mercy of God, has it a right to desist from the work, when liberty herself calls her to it? Beckwith justly wrote to the *Moderateur* of the Waldensian Church: "Either you will be missionaries or you will be nothing." Consequently the Waldensians went to work, and as we shall see, not in vain. The Waldensian Synod, which met from the 1st to the 4th of August, 1848, resolved to celebrate annually the day of liberation, Feb. 17th, and gave orders to the Board (*la Table*) to favor the use of the Italian language in public instruction and the sermon, in all communities where such measures could be carried out. It was added, "Italians by birth and character, destined to exert our activity in the midst of a population which speaks only this language, we were obliged to adopt another language under the oppression whose victims we were for centuries. Now, that this oppression has ceased, now that our country concedes the same rights to us as to all her

children, and demands that we should devote our talents and powers to her service, we are bound, if we do not wish to give up our task, to return to our origin and to accept again our own language."

"Quite probably," says the first Waldensian evangelist (Bart. Malan), "the edict for the liberation of the Waldensians, placed this Church into a new position; but at the same time, new duties were imposed upon it."

Before the new road was regularly set out upon, the "Table" sent several younger ministers to Florence to gain a practical knowledge of and exercise in the Italian language. A few years before this, a lady of Geneva was already very active at Pisa in improving primary instruction and education generally, by means of so-called Asylums. Associated with her, Charles Eynard, also from Geneva, the friend of Ricasoli, exerted a decisive influence. They entered into intercourse with Montanelli, Guicciardini and even with Lambruschini. From this time dates the activity of Tito Chiese. They attempted to work positively, but not polemically. They had no success. Lambruschini was called, in derision and without reason, "*Il Luterino*" (the little Luther). After Italy had been called upon to reconcile all things—the Bible, the Council of Trent, Pius IX. and liberty—the rest was left to time, the improvement of education and the silkworms. The first private evangelical meetings were held at Florence in 1844 and at Pisa in 1846. The first public assemblies in the Swiss and German Protestant chapel in 1849 were presided over by the Waldensian pastor Barthél. Malan. But the police interfered and forbade them. Several Protestants were afterwards arrested, among them Count Guicciardini;—they were exiled. In the meantime the movement continued at Florence and spread into the province. Francesco Madiati and his wife were cast into prison. Their trial excited notice and the Evangelical Alliance was interested in the case, but without being able to obtain a promise of tolerance of evangelical worship. The coals glowed under the ashes until the year 1860, which became the year of liberty for Florence. It must be acknowledged that this was partly due to a committee from Geneva, partly to the persistent effort of Dr. Stewart, of Livorno,

who outlived this committee, which unfortunately was sectarian, and became the chief pillar of the Waldensian mission at Toskana and other places.

In the meantime Louis de Sanctis was converted at Rome through the Bible, renounced a position coveted by his colleagues, and went to Malta, where he began to evangelize Italy by means of his pen, by editing the periodical "*Il Catholico Cristiano*." On this island he entered into relation with other so-called evangelical priests who stood far beneath him in every respect. He afterwards came to Geneva and there requested the ordination of the Waldensian Church.

The first real evangelist of the Waldensian Church was J. P. Meille. His first definite location was at Turin, where in 1854 a beautiful house of worship was erected, as it were, under the eyes of Gen. Beckwith. His second charge was at Genoa assisted by the evangelist, P. Geymonat. Each of these evangelists for a time had an ardent preacher as co-laborer, the former having De Sanctis, the latter Mazzarella. Success was retarded by a discussion among the Waldensians concerning the church "*della gran Madre di Dio*" at Genoa. This church had been bought by the Waldensians, but the archbishop of this city, misusing his influence on the young king Victor Emmanuel, whose tutor he had been, induced the latter to refuse the permission of sale. The king commissioned Cavour to persuade the Waldensians to relinquish their claims. They did so for prudential reasons. It was a period in which it was not safe to irritate a government liberal already, as this, in order to check the Waldensian missions; it only needed to apply the statutes literally. But Mazzarella and his friends did not think so. They proclaimed the affair as a scandal, accused the Waldensians of having mingled with idolators, and why? Because, by returning the church, Catholic worship was again restored in it! We can respect the voice of conscience in this matter, but how can we understand, that, but a few years later, Mazzarella, who always has been a minister of the Gospel, took part in the subscription for the erection of a monument to Voltaire, at Paris?

The separation took place at Turin and Genoa at the same time and soon found adherents in the Committee at Geneva and

the door was now open to Plymouthism and other isms, so much so, that De Sanctis, who possessed strength of character and a clear mind and also thought much of order, returned weary and exhausted to the Waldensians who received him as professor in the Seminary. Count Guicciardini, who at that time had with Chiesi signed his name to a proclamation to the Waldensian Church, to obtain from them an evangelist for Toscana, took part with the separatists and became their *Leader* and benefactor, as he supported them with money from abroad. This man, but for his eccentricity, might have become the Zinzendorf of Italy, had he wished it; now, himself near death, he witnesses the death of his own party. While Plymouthism devastated the field of mission, discord raged in its midst. Several congregations separated from others and called upon the Scotch pastor MacDougall, who dwelt in Florence, to render them aid. That was rendered, and, what was more, in such a manner that beside the "Chiese Cristiana Libera de' Fratelli" arose the "Unione della Chiese Libera." That is the "Unione" which to-day approaches the Waldensians and intends to unite with them. Other new denominations settled in Italy: the Wesleyans, the Baptists (open and close communion), the Methodist Episcopal, &c. This one day induced our king to exclaim "Quante tinte!" (How many shades!) which a Scotchman, who knew more of German than of Italian, translated in the "Family Treasury": "What a quantity of ink!"

Let us return to the Waldensians. I will say a few words on their missions as it is impossible to report on these in detail. In this work we may distinguish three successive periods:

I. From 1848 to 1860. During this time the missions were superintended by the "Table" which had its seat in the valleys. Their evangelists, ever since the founding of the theological school at Torre-Pellice (1854) were sent out from there.

II. From 1860 to 1872. The theological school was removed to Florence, to the Palace Salviati and the direction of the missions was entrusted to a commission consisting of five members and which was distinct from the "Table" but subordinate to the Synod.

III. From 1872 to 1885. Upon invitation of the commission

the new congregations sent their delegates to Florence where the first general Missionary Convention was held in 1872. Other conventions followed at Florence, Genoa, Turin and Milan. The Conference is not a full synod, (the Synod proper convenes every year in the month of September at Torre-Pellice) but will soon become one, if it does not wish to merge with the Synod into one legislative assembly. Between the General Conference and the church offices are the District Conferences, which correspond to the former Colloquies. These District Conferences are five in number and extend over all Italy from Susa to Catania.

The following are a few statistics from which the progress of the church can, in a measure be estimated.

In the year 1848 the Waldensian Church had 18 ministers, 15 congregations, several elementary schools, and the gymnasium and boarding school at Torre-Pellice (the former for young men, the latter for girls) and two hospitals, but nothing outside of the valleys. In the year 1885, we find in the Valleys 24 ministers; at Florence there is a theological seminary from which about 100 ministers have been sent out, some of whom have charges in the valleys, others are evangelists in the missionary work, or pastors in the Canton Grisons or in the Waldensian colony in South America. The number of new congregations is 43; the number of communicants about 4,000; the number of occasional hearers amounts to 30,000 or 40,000 a year. The Sunday-schools are attended by 2180 children, the sum total of the voluntary contributions for the missions amounts to 57000 francs.

The contributions may be regarded as an excellent sign. I remark here that we do not deal with the congregations in the Waldensian valleys, but with the new missions scattered through all districts and in which the rich are as few as in the Valleys. From the following may be seen the increase in contributions: In 1870, 9504.17 francs; in 1874, 23839.25 francs; in 1880, 49469.76 francs; in 1884, 57128.57 francs; *i. e.* there are on the average 15.19 francs for each communicant.

These sums certainly do not suffice, but they guarantee what we wish to carry out, the "*far da sé*" (Doing of one's self, *i. e.* with own means.) Some congregations are already in good or-

der, as far as this is concerned, namely those of Turin, Nizza ; others are on the point of attaining it, as those of Milan and Genoa. I might mention also, that the little congregation which assembles at Florence in the house of the theological school, requires no money for support. But, as has been said, our means are not sufficient for the maintenance of the missions, much less so, when the latter progress. We stand in need of the voluntary contributions which come from Great Britain, Holland, the United States and Germany. The Gustav Adolph Verein especially has a claim to our gratitude for the yearly contributions which it sends, for the support of our Seminary. The Committee at Stuttgart and other lesser aids, directly help in the work of evangelization.

The Waldensian mission has so to speak been crowned at Rome, where its church was opened Nov. 25th, 1883. The building in the purest Romance style is said to add to the beauty of the city which is otherwise so rich in works of art of every description. I refrain from giving account of the work of colporteur, asylums, and other works of benevolence. I will only refer to the library called Guicciardini, a collection of books which Count Guicciardini has presented to his native city and which contains several thousand writings relative to the Reformation of the 16th century and the religious condition of the present age.

After all, this is still in its nascent state, or rather, in its state of regeneration in this period of liberty which has not yet lasted half a century. And the literature makes no exception.

Let us begin with the periodical press. This has gone through some experience. Twenty-four evangelical Italian papers have already ceased publication, among them six Waldensian. To-day fourteen journals appear. This excessive number is due to the number of sects of which there are seven. Let us hope they will not pass beyond this number. With a little more practical consideration, the number of periodicals might be restricted to three ; namely a paper for children, a weekly paper for general news and information, and a monthly review. "L'Amico de'Fanciulli" answers the first purpose ; twelve illustrated mag-



azines rival to fulfill the second; "*L'Italia Evangelica*" alone is generally read, and principally for this reason that it is not sectarian; and finally, the "*Rivista Cristiana*" for almost thirteen years tries to answer the third purpose. I remark here, that the "*Rivista Cristiana*" offers foreign readers the advantage of helping to awaken the study of the Italian Reformation of the 16th century, as it publishes documents of our archives, and, moreover, it does not fail to report on the condition of religious affairs in Italy.

Let us pass over to the books. They are almost all printed in the "*Tipographia Claudiana*" which was opened at Turin at the beginning of the missions and was so named in memory of Bishop Claudius. It was removed to Florence in 1861 and is now connected with the firm Salviati. It is controlled by a committee of the English tendency, but not in English spirit. According to their account of the year 1884, they had in twelve months printed 137,955 copies of books and tracts; 28,700 copies of the almanac, "*L'Amico di Casa*," 72,800 copies of the weekly "*L'Italia Evangelica*;" 60,000 copies of the "*Amico de' Fanciulli*;" 11,700 copies of the "*Rivista Cristiana*" and had an income of 30,753 francs.

Among the books printed here, we find different editions of the Bible, works on biblical philology, archæology, introductions to the Holy Scriptures, works on hermeneutics, commentaries, histories of the Waldensian Church, dogmatics, ethics, apologetics, polemics and practical theology. Among these, quite a number are translations.

## ARTICLE VI.

## OBSTACLES TO LUTHERAN UNION.

By REV. G. H. GERBERDING, A. M., Fargo, Dak.

The subject of an organic union of the sadly separated and sometimes hostile factions of the Lutheran Church in the United States has of late been the subject of no little anxious thought and earnest prayer. Many, who bear the Lutheran name, have been looking forward hopefully to the coming together of our unhappily torn and severed household. And if all the varied nationalities and types of foreign Lutheranism cannot come together at present, then it is hoped that the American Lutheran Church, *i. e.* that part of it which uses the English language in her public service may become one.

That such a union is desirable, needs no argument. It would certainly minister to the satisfaction, peace and comfort of us all. It would certainly give us a standing and prestige in the sight of others, such as we never enjoyed. It would give us an influence and a power that would make themselves felt in every community where there is an English Lutheran church. But, better than all that, what a husbanding would it not be to our resources. What an increase in our working force. What abilities to spread out and enter the open doors that everywhere invite us. We need not stop to recount the advantages that would accrue to our Home and Foreign Mission work. Every thoughtful person who is at all conversant with the humiliating facts of our present rivalry and crippled work can see at a glance, that, could our whole English Lutheran Church work hand in hand and heart with heart, it would be as life from the dead.

And what a mission has not God given to the Mother Church of the Reformation in this new world! We firmly believe that God has laid on no other Church a work like that which he has laid on our hands. We believe that the mission which the Great Head of the Church has for the Mother of Protestants in this land is second only to the mission she had for Germany in

the 16th century. The whole land is open to us. In New England, the home of the Pilgrim Fathers, a bald and legalistic Puritanism has shown itself unable to hold its own children. Unbelief and misbelief of every kind have largely supplanted it. Hundreds of former "meeting houses" stand vacant, or are used for the dissemination of the vagaries of schismatics. And this whole region is lately filling up rapidly with the sturdy Scandinavians. They come with their Norske and Swenska Bibles, with Luther's Catechism and sermons. They are bringing in the ever fresh and new life of the old Gospel, as brought out by the great Reformation. We believe that if the Lutheran Church does her duty she will yet redeem New England, and infuse the new life of the pure old faith into its dreary intellectual wastes.

In the Middle and older Western states, the old synods are suddenly finding themselves confronted with an immense mission work at home. On every hand towns and cities are springing up, almost like in the west; and wherever a canvass is made, material found for Lutheran churches. And what shall we say of this mighty West! Of a domain that would make a score of empires! Of its individual states and territories that could hold and maintain the strongest nations of Europe on their soil! What shall we say of the unnumbered cities that are springing up as if by magic! Of its many great centres of population, doubling their inhabitants every three or five years! And nearly every school-district, village and city teeming with Lutherans! Many of them still speak and prefer their mother tongue. But in this enterprising, progressive and stimulating west they Americanize rapidly. The public school system, even in most of the territories, is in advance of the east. The children of foreign Lutherans attend these excellent schools. When through with them they almost unanimously prefer the English language. If they cannot find it in a Lutheran church, they find it elsewhere. Others are ready to offer, with a bribe thrown in, what we are too slow to give. But, enough. The heart of a lover of our Lutheran Zion grows faint and sick, when it contemplates what might be done and what should be done, and what is not done.

And is this a time for us to fritter away our strength, our means, and our time in unholy rivalries and sinful strife?

But, ardently as we desire, and fervently as we would pray for a union of our poor distracted Church, we would still deprecate an unrighteous and baseless alliance. *How can two walk together except they be agreed?* We would have the one *faith* and *baptism* as well as the one Lord. We would *contend earnestly for the faith once delivered to the saints*. We believe there can be no permanent or profitable union unless it grow out of a unity of faith. Would such a union be possible? Why not? What should hinder it? We believe the following are some of the most serious

#### OBSTACLES TO A LUTHERAN UNION.

I. There are those who ask too much. They are *hyper-orthodox*. They out-Luther Luther. They are given to hair-splitting distinctions and unreasonable exactions. They belong to that school of heresy-hunters who discovered several hundred dangerous errors in Arndt's True Christianity, and who condemned Spener, Francke, and Henry Melchior Muhlenberg. Their Lutheranism consists largely in *deductions* from the confessions, and deductions from these deductions. They often judge a man's Lutheranism by the cut of the coat he preaches in, by the shape of the bread he administers or receives the communion in, by the motion of his hands in pronouncing the benediction, or by the architectural arrangement of the church he preaches in! And if forsooth one should carry the Lutheran doctrine into an un-Lutheran church, and preach it to a non-Lutheran congregation, they are ready to hold up their hands in holy horror! The part of the Augsburg Confession in which such Lutherans find most pleasure is in the *damnants*.

We simply ask, in passing, is this the type of Lutheranism that God, in His Providence, first planted in this land? Was this the Lutheranism of Muhlenberg and the Fathers?

Even if it were desirable to form a union on the basis of these extremists, it would be folly to ever expect the whole Church to be educated up to them. But they are an obstacle.

II. On the other hand we find a grievous obstacle in persons who call themselves Lutheran, but who have nothing Lutheran about them but the name. They openly and often bitterly re-

pudiate the distinguishing doctrines of the Church whose name they bear. Calling themselves by Luther's name they disseminate and defend the views of Zwingli and Karlstadt. Members of the Lutheran Church, they carry on their Church work after the pattern of Methodists and others. Shall we have a union on *their* basis? Is that the Lutheranism which God planted on our shores, by the Halle Fathers? Were they ashamed of the distinctive doctrines of their Church? Did they ever give them away? Are these distinctive doctrines unscriptural? Is there nothing about them worth contending for? Is the Lutheran system inferior to others? Has it nothing to glory in, over against other systems? Must we ever apologize for it and try to explain it away? If so the sooner we disband the better. Then it is a crying sin for us to keep up our separate and expensive organizations. To form a Lutheran union on the basis of such liberalists would certainly be suicidal. To contend for such a union is a serious obstacle to a true union.

III. Another very formidable obstacle to an understanding and a union we believe to be the personal grudges and animosities of leading men. During the heated discussions that culminated at and followed Fort Wayne many things were said that hurt keenly. There were personal encounters, charges, denials and counter charges, criminations and recriminations, victories and victims. As usual, the carnal weapons were often more apparent than the spiritual. Positions were taken, and there was often more concern for holding a position taken than for vindicating God's truth or furthering his cause. Wounded pride, heart-burnings, personal grievances and grudges were the inevitable result. The scars of those old wounds are not yet all healed. They still smart whenever they are touched. The *rabies theologorum* has left its bitterness behind. The memory of personal combat, and perhaps defeat, still lingers. Mention union to such battle-scarred warriors, and they quickly retort: "Union with whom? Do you think I could work in harness with Dr. So and So? No I cannot coöperate with such men. I do not wish to have anything to do with them." And so the poor Church must bleed and suffer and remain rent asunder to gratify the personal grudges and vanities of a few leaders! We verily

believe that if a general Diet could be held of *young* men, who have not been in the ministry longer than twelve or fifteen years, who have no personal wrongs to redress, no piques to avenge, or wounded pride to demand satisfaction, an organic union could speedily be arranged; and that too on a sound Lutheran basis. Why not have such a Diet called?

IV. Another serious obstacle to a union, we believe, exists in the lifeless formalism of many who claim to be very rigid Lutherans. They are exceedingly zealous for their extra-confessional points of doctrine. They are uncompromising sticklers for forms and ceremonies. They insist on a scrupulous observance of the external acts and duties of religion. But they are sadly negligent of the heart and life. Not that we would say one word against a diligent and scrupulous use of Church ordinances and sacraments. We believe that these are divinely ordained helps and means of grace. But there is such a thing as trusting in the outward act, regardless of the condition of heart. And it is a humiliating fact that in many of our churches the stress is laid on the externals, to the sad and perilous neglect of the internal. Repentance, conversion and holiness of heart and life are little insisted on. Profanity, drunkenness, saloon-keeping and other great and shameful sins may prevail. If only the *reine Lehre* is professed, the sacraments observed and the sects condemned! We believe that such pastors and churches are a fruitful source of loss to our Church, a disgrace to our name and a dangerous obstacle to peace and union.

V. Again. We find in certain quarters a false pride in consistency, an aversion to admitting a change of conviction. Conscientiousness, according to some, consists in never receding from a position once taken, and in never being convinced of being wrong. Such persons seem to think that a confession of having once been wrong, and of having learned better is humiliating and unmanly. Some of these persons drank in the rationalistic and unlutheran spirit that prevailed so generally a score or more of years ago. They do not seem to know that there has been a revival of the old faith, a coming back to the pure truth of the divine Word. They are terribly afraid of acknowledging that they and their teachers and colleagues have

entertained wrong views, and that some one else is more loyal to *all* that Christ has commanded. They deprecate all Diets or doctrinal discussions, lest it should be even intimated that their adherence to the confession is not correct. This false pride, in a stagnant consistency, this unwillingness to examine, to be convinced and to confess when convinced, is not the least drawback to an understanding and a union.

VI. Another hindrance is found in the great desire of many to stand well with the influential and popular churches around them. They are wonderfully afraid of being peculiar, they would not dare to differ from their respected neighbors. If the distinctive doctrines of the Lutheran Church are repugnant to the churches around them, they keep them in the back-ground, if they do not openly repudiate them. These timeservers, more afraid of giving offence to the polite popular ear than of being disloyal to what God has revealed, more anxious to please man than to be true to the truth, either having no convictions of their own, or not having the courage of their convictions, are a stumbling block in the way of a sound Lutheran union. They would be more at home in one of those churches, in which every man can believe as he pleases, and where the ministers standard seems to be, not what do my people *need*, but what would they *like*.

VII. And still another drawback doubtless exists in the sectionalism of part of our church. There are some who seem to glory in, labor for and defend their own particular synod or organization far more than the Lutheran faith. If all could or would embrace and ever speak out the sentiments of Dr. Jacobs at the banquet of the Martin Luther Society in New York several months ago, what a different spirit would come over our Zion! Dr. Jacobs said: "What is the chief and in fact the only glory of our beloved Lutheran Church but the pure Gospel of the grace of God? What is it but that simple faith of the Gospel, set forth so clearly in our confessions, which when explained against misunderstandings, and defended against misrepresentations that have accumulated for centuries, satisfies so fully the longings of the human heart for peace with God, imparts, as nowhere else, the assurance of personal salvation through Christ's



merits; and commends itself to every man's conscience in the sight of God. Every distinctive doctrine of her faith upon which the Lutheran Church insists, she prizes only because it belongs to that truth, through which alone the believer's daily communion with his Saviour is maintained.

Perish every institution of man's devising, call it 'General Council' 'General Synod' or what you please—however great the blessings which it has imparted in the past—provided the one faith of the Lutheran Church continue to be transmitted from generation to generation, until that glad day when faith shall yield to the blessed sight of that Lord in whose unseen communion we now walk and love made perfect shall kindle every eye and inspire every thought and word."

Let such devotion to the faith take the place of the prevalent sectionalism and an understanding will speedily come.

VIII. In conclusion we briefly mention one more obstacle to a speedy union. We find it in part of our Lutheran press. Is it not true that we have Lutheran church papers that often give unstinted praise to other churches, their institutions, spirit and men, and yet have little to say in defense of the faith and institutions of their own church? How rare it is to find an article in their columns setting forth and defending the distinctive doctrines of our church! The constant effort seems to be far more to please the other prominent churches, than to establish and build up our own. They have much to say in favor of a union of all denominations but scarcely a word in favor of a union of Lutherans. They seem to aim at killing all efforts in that direction by an ominous silence. Our church is suffering, in some parts, from an inefficient, disloyal and sectional press.

We close with the words of Dr. Wolf, in his address on Heinrich Melchior Muhlenberg:

"Muhlenberg was an instrument of divine Providence as unmistakably as was Martin Luther. All part and divisions of the Lutheran Church in this country gratefully acknowledge this and rejoice over it. And there can be little doubt that by all accepting his teachings, adopting his measures, and cherishing his

spirit, we might not only come again under one banner but follow Christ in one mighty body. For this let all be praying. Amen."

---

## ARTICLE VII.

### LUTHER'S PLACE IN HISTORY.

By REV. J. C. F. RUPP, A. M., Zelienople, Pa.

If it is true, as Carlyle says, that the condition of the world is the practical realization and embodiment of the thought that dwells in its great men, and that the soul of history is the history of these; then, surely, the Lutheran Reformation of the sixteenth century is the soul of modern history. For, henceforth, the genius of history is imbued with Luther's spirit and personifies his thought. The French historian, M. Guizot, compendiously calls the Reformation the trunk from which branches out all subsequent history. That, in brief, expresses Luther's relation to the individual elements of modern civilization: not so much the development of new principles as the statement of old truths in new relations. His place in history is rather the measure of his potent influence in the religious and civil world, than a definite circumscribed spot on a historical background whose limits, are being constantly narrowed by the lengthening perspective of receding ages. It is rather the widening influence of the oasis whose exuberant fertility and richness is gradually encroaching upon and reclaiming the surrounding desert. History is the record of the religious and intellectual struggles and triumphs of humanity. Such was the sphere of Luther's influence, not temporary but permanent, not a fixed locality but a growing power.

Circumstances had much to do in determining Luther's place in history. For all the ages contribute their part to the final perfection of the Church's life, but then had arisen a crisis in her history similar to the crises produced by the influence of the early heathen and the mediæval skeptical philosophy. This decisive hour was occasioned by the downfall of Constantinople which caused in the consequent revival of learning the first

blush of the new intellectual morning. It was an event which apparently threatened the existence of the oldest, the Greek, type of Christianity, but was in reality the seeding whose harvest will be a new ingathering. It was only one of the direct causes of a general awakening, only one of many providential movements in human life and progress that mark the beginnings of Luther's work. There were other elements in the divine alembic, all of which in the fulness of time were fused into one mass. He was the alchemist or means, perhaps, at the risk of mixing figures, I may venture to call him the prism or burning-glass by which the searching and intense light and heat of God's word were concentrated upon the ingredients of the human solution. This grand climacteric was preceded by the slow accumulation and development of ages. But there are disturbing influences that foretell every catastrophe in the natural world, although the fatal consequences, in the crises, may be as unexpected as the Charleston and Rivera earthquakes. In the same way, like secondary causes, but falling far short of their complete consummation, different pre-reformatory movements which were necessary to its successful issue, ushered in the Reformation era. These were the flashes indicative of the gathering storm. They were evidences of a power which, when it is intelligently used, is irresistible. They were the necessary beacons blazing up to arouse the yet unappreciative masses of humanity, and to forewarn and prepare the divinely commissioned movers of the still latent energy. The genius of life became keenly responsive to its new instincts. When aroused from its deathlike stupor it found active employment, on one hand, in extended commerce and discovery, while, on the other, it was broadened in culture by the renewal of learning. In this sense Luther became the creature of circumstances, like Aeneas, the *quorum pars magna*. He was thus given deeper consciousness, warmer sympathies, keener insight, and larger outlook,—an unquestionably divine commission for the most decisive work in the Church's history.

In the second place, we must not overlook the character of the Church itself,—which was so important a factor—in determining Luther's place. There were in it many elements hostile

to the principles of Christianity, nevertheless it was a natural sequence of preëxisting conditions. Its Latin character was engrafted upon the forms of Germanic life and thought. This was in itself an incongruity and no indifferent element in determining the final result of Luther's work. Latin Christianity grew out of the ruins of an ancient civilization whose leading characteristics it assimilated. In Italy and Spain, and measurably so in France, the Gothic and Frankish and other invaders adopted the forms of civilization already existing in their several provinces, and became also Latin Christians. In Germany, however, so far as the national idea obtained, the Latin type of Christianity was grafted upon a civilization more or less native, and Germanic in its spirit. In all the Romance countries the invading barbarians adopted also the Latin tongue, whilst in Germany the people retained in its purity their native language. But Latin Christianity everywhere carries with it the leading characteristics of its adopted civilization and customs. By external richness and pomp it seeks to win the affection and loyalty of the people, and in its characteristic Roman imperialism it demands absolute submission to its authority. Such were the characteristics of the mediæval Church as described in *The Marble Prophecy*:

"The godlike liberty wherewith the Christ  
Had made His people free she stole from them,  
And made them slaves to new observances.  
She sucked the juice  
Of all prosperities within her realms  
Until her gaudy temples blazed with gold  
And from a thousand altars flashed the fire  
Of precious gems. To win her countless wealth  
She sold as merchandise the gift of God."

Thus we see a foreign growth and development fixed upon German life, for even the secular authority seemed to be enlisted in the Church's service. But whilst there was full harmony in all external requirements, there were also buried deep in Christian life and consciousness hidden forces which were destined to rend the Church asunder.

In determining Luther's place in history there is another element of importance equal to the character of the Church and to

the stupendous events of the preceding epoch. It is his personality as seen in his character and in his qualifications. Luther was a self-conscious agent in directing the forces in this providential work. It was a revival in religious life akin to the renaissance in learning and every human industry. The moral courage which enabled him to make a good confession of faith by publicly defending his convictions is the germ whose growth and development have produced the very best facts in the structure of modern civilization. Whilst, on one hand, we must carefully guard against the exclusion of all human agency in this divine work, we must as carefully avoid the opposite extreme. We may no more regard this revival of religious life as exclusively Luther's work than we can regard successful evangelistic work in our large cities the exclusive work of D. L. Moody or Dr. Pentecost. God does use human instrumentality and human means. In many respects Luther was such an evangelist to the Church. His personal qualifications, were a necessary requisite and of almost paramount importance, but they were only the means of transmitting God's word, which is the only efficient moving principle in all evangelistic work. This we teach who regard Luther as the agent under God to remove the veil from the brightness of Christianity, to vindicate free thought and liberty of conscience, and to re-establish the supreme authority of the divine word.

Luther was an architect. His design was drawn in the spirit of God's word from the models of great masters and it combined in perfect symmetry the cardinal ideas of their majestic cathedrals built of living stones into a beautiful temple to the Most High. The same duality obtains here to which everything in Christian life and doctrine conforms. The Divine Founder of the Church is of two-fold nature, God and man; the Church itself and the Word on which it is built are both divine and human. Christian life is the effect of divine grace communicated thereby through human personality, and the Reformation which has been called a full-page illustration of Christian life and experience was brought about by God's word through Luther's work. For it was the animating principle and the prime motor of his work. He wove into the fabric of Christian life and ex-

perience no new threads, but simply restored its primary colors and original designs. He directed the eyes of the world to the Life which is the Light of the world, and after the fashion of this Life and in the glory of this Light, which shines through the midnight of the dark ages, was reared a new building of Christian and Church life and activity, and Bible doctrine, on the old foundation of the Catholic Apostolic Church.

Luther's place in history is best measured by his influence in "pure religion and undefiled before God and the Father." There lingered in the heart of true religion an earnest longing for the pure word of life, and the consequent and no less accurate recognition of abuses. Thus again the word was the vital power of the Reformation. Whilst it was apparently latent, as in a mass of fuel, it was speedily kindled when induced by the divine power in Luther's work. Its influence on Luther's life is well known. In the words of a distinguished divine: "that Book was to him the thing of beauty of his life, the joy of his soul forever." It was incorporated into his being and it pictured in his experience the whole period of the Reformation. It made him first a Christian, then a Reformer.

So it was the Spirit of Christ through his word, not Luther, nor the age, that was the efficient vitalizing cause of the Reformation. He found in the word of life, righteousness by faith alone and thereby he anchored his soul to Christ, the rock of his salvation. The word became first the substance and reality of his faith, then his rule of authority. But there was no revolution in his mind, only a reformation, a work progressive but gradual. He appealed from the Pope to a council and finally at Worms rested his faith only on the everlasting word.

These are some of the boundary lines of Luther's place in history. They are sufficient to give him a local habitation and a name in the great commonwealth of human destiny. What are some of the permanent results of his work included within these limits of "the land o' the leal?"

One grand result was the gaining for religion an acknowledgment of its true relation to the state. Mark the treaty of Passau which, as stipulated in the peace of Augsburg, secured for Lutheranism amnesty, equal rights and universal peace. The

next advance included all Protestants in the enjoyment of these privileges, when, after the thirty years' war had desolated all Europe, almost on the centenary of the Augsburg Confession, differences in religion ceased to be justifiable causes of war, and liberty of conscience and freedom of judgment were adjudged worthy of place in public morals and political ethics.

But Luther's place is less political than social. He made religion more than a spectacle, or a series of splendid ceremonies. It is now the spring of life and is carried over into every phase of intellectual activity. Christianity, Ruskin beautifully says, is the heart of all that is best and truest and most nobly human and most spiritual in modern art. This is eminently true not only of art, but rather of every form and variety of art. Where have the liberal arts attained a more perfect development than when fostered by the kindly principles of the Reformation? It has transformed the spirit of literature, has cultivated the beauty and grace of sacred song, and perfected the most thorough systems of Christian education. The Germanic characteristic of personal liberty and individualism has, in large measure, penetrated wherever the Reformation has been felt; as it was an impulse to further the Reformation, so it has been a powerful incentive to make religion a personal, material interest with all classes. It grounded religious knowledge upon the only source and one rule of faith, it has revived religion and made it real over against storms of skepticism, and has aroused the Church to a deeper and active consciousness of self and duty.

In short, we see in Luther's place and work his own life and unswerving loyalty to God and principle. Perhaps the fittest description of Luther's *place* is found in these words of Carlyle: "In all epochs of the world's history, we find the great man to have been the savior of his epoch: the spiritual lightning without which the fuel never would have burned. The history of the world, I said already, was the biography of great men." The power of this *place* and *work* is thus described by Dr. Krauth: "Four potentates ruled the mind of Europe in the Reformation, the Emperor, Erasmus, the Pope, and Luther. The Pope wanes, Erasmus is little, the Emperor is nothing, but Luther abides as a power for all time. His image casts itself



upon the current of ages, as the mountain mirrors itself in the river that winds at its foot—the mighty fixing itself immutably upon the changing.”

## GERMAN LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

**THEOLOGICAL.**—*Religion nach dem Neuen Testament* mit besonderer Beziehung auf das Verhältniss des Sittlichen und Religiösen und auf das Mystische in der Religion. Jul. Köstlin. pp. 102. Gotha. An able contribution to the Ritschl Controversy. Third edition of Thomasius' great work: *Christi Person und Werk*. Darstellung der evangelisch luther. Dogmatik vom Mittelpunkt der Christologie aus. Edited by F. J. Winter. II. (closing) Vol. pp. 622. Erlangen. *Grundriss der Symbolik* für Vorlesungen. Dr. G. Plitt. 2d Edition. pp. 184. Erlangen. *Grundriss der Protestantischen Religionslehre*. Dr. Paul Melhorn. 2. Revised Edition. pp. 55. Leipsic. *Das Selbstbewusstsein Jesu* im Lichte der messianischen Hoffnungen seiner Zeit. Lic. W. Baldensperger. pp. 193. Strassburg. *Zum Entscheidungskampf um den Christlichen Glauben* in der Gegenwart. Ein Wort an die Suchenden unter Deutschland's Gebildeten. Karl. Wilh. Ziegler. pp. 252. Tübingen.

**BIBLICAL.**—Cremer's *Biblisch-theologisches Wörterbuch* der neutestamentlichen Gräcität. 5th Edition. pp. 922. Gotha. A standard Lexicon, invaluable to biblical students. *Der Prophet Jesaja erläutert*. Prof. Dr. C. J. Bredenkamp. 2. u. 3. Lfg. pp. 85-387. Erlangen. *Wissenschaftlicher und practischer Commentar über den 1. Petrusbrief*. Part. II. Pfr. J. M. Usteri. pp. 349. Zürich. Excellent. *Die Bücher Esra, Nechemiah und Ester*. Prof. E. Bertheau. 2d edition edited by Prof. Vict. Ryssel. pp. 446. Leipsic. Reuss' *Geschichte der heiligen Schriften Neuen Testaments* has appeared in the 6th enlarged and improved edition. pp. 686. Braunschweig. *Das Hohelied* in seiner Einheit und dramatischen Gliederung mit Uebersetzung und Beigaben. Dr. Joh. Gust. Stickel. pp. 187. Berlin. *Die Auferstehung Jesu Christi*. Eine historische Untersuchung für die Gebildeten. E. G. Steude. pp. 132. Leipzig. *Das Evangelium nach Johannes*, ausgelegt. Dr. Gust. Fred. Wahle. pp. 714. Gotha.

**HISTORICAL.**—*Das Urchristenthum*, seine Schriften und Lehren, in geschichtl. Zusammenhang beschrieben. O. Pfeleiderer. pp. 891. Berlin. *Geschichte der Christlichen Ethik*. Dr. W. Gass. Vol. II. 2 parts, pp. 372, 368. Berlin. *Die lutherische Kanzel*. Beiträge zur Geschichte der Religion, Politik u. Cultur im 17 Jahrh. J. Diefenbach. pp. 208. Mayence. Second edition of Thomasius' unsurpassed work on *Die christliche Dogmengeschichte* edited by Profs. Bonwetsch and

Seeberg of Dorpat. Vol. I. Die Dogmengeschichte der alten Kirche. Periode der Patristik. pp. 620. Erlangen. *Geschichte der Predigt in Deutschland* von Karl dem Grossen bis zum Ausgange des 14. Jahrhunderts. Dr. Anton Linsenmayer. pp. 490. Munich. Kurtz's *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte für Studierende* has appeared in the 10th edition. Four parts in three Vols. pp. 363, 348, 353, 351. Leipsic. *Geschichte des spanischen Protestantismus im 16. Jahrhundert.* C. A. Wilkens. pp. 259. Gütersloh. *Das Symbol des Fisches* und die Fischendenkmäler der römischen Katakomben. H. Achelis. pp. 111. Marburg. *Abriss einer Geschichte der evangelischen Kirche* auf dem europäischen Festlande im 19 Jahr. 2 wesentlich verb. Aufl. A. Zahn. pp. 254. Stuttgart. *Urkundenfunde zur Geschichte des christlichen Alterthums.* Dr. G. V. Lechler. pp. 80. Leipsic. *Das Leben Jesu.* In two volumes. 3d ed. Vol. I. B. Weiss. pp. 539. Berlin.

MISCELLANEOUS.—*Luther's Anschauungen vom christlichen Gottesdienst und seine thatsächliche Reform deselben.* Prof. Dr. John Gottschick. pp. 81. Freiburg i. Br. *Ueber Moralpredigten, ihre Berechtigung, Zweckmässigkeit, und rechte Beschaffenheit.* Homiletische Studien und Erwägungen, den Mitarbeitern im Predigamt vorgelegt. Past. Dr. Gust. Schulze. pp. 108. Leipsic. Abounding in wholesome counsels and suggestions. *Das Leben der Christen ein Gottesdienst.* Essay, zu Nutz und Frommen der christlichen Gesellschaft verfasst. Past. Wilh. Tiling. pp. 170. Riga. *Predigtentwürfe* Schleiermacher's, aus dem Jahr 1800. Edited by Past. Dr. Friedr. Zimmer. 51 selections. pp. 75. Gotha. Palmer's *Evangelische Homiletik.* 6th ed. revised by Lic. O. Kirn. pp. 569. Stuttgart. *Die Antike Ethik in ihrer geschichtlichen Entwicklung*, als Einleitung in die Geschichte der christlichen Moral dargestellt. Dr. Chr. Ernst Luthardt. pp. 187. Leipsic.

## REVIEW OF RECENT LITERATURE.

### I.—BIBLICAL.

*The Book of Job*, (According to the Version of 1885.) With an Expository and Practical Commentary, Enriched with illustrations from some of the most Eminent Modern Expositors, and a Critical Introduction. By Daniel Curry, D. D., LL. D. pp. 302. \$2.00. New York: Phillips and Hunt.

Of making many Commentaries there is no end, but as long as a mind like Dr. Curry's pursues the method followed in this work, that of combining and adapting to the needs of intelligent readers who are not specialists, the best results of modern criticism and exegesis, there

is no danger of having too many. There is no striving here after originality, no parade of the author's learning, no bewildering exhibit of diverse and conflicting interpretations, no labored effort to add to the sum of learned exposition, but there is manifest a supreme aim to furnish an expository key to this book of Holy Writ, which more than any other portion of Scripture has suffered from mistranslation and faulty and false exegesis, and to enable biblical students who are dependent on their vernacular English, to interpret correctly the teachings of this profound Hebrew poem.

The scholars most deferred to by the author are Delitzsch and Davidson. Their theory of the unhistorical, didactic and dramatic character of the book is substantially accepted, and its expositions as to its details and as a whole have been made under the influence of such ideas, although the practical results are but little affected by the question respecting the historical, legendary or simply fictitious nature of the narrative portions. "Upon a slight and scanty framework of narrated incidents are here suspended some of the most profound truths respecting God's justice and mercy." "As an abundantly authenticated portion of the sacred volume, the Book of Job must be accepted and treated as a revelation from heaven, teaching lessons that transcend the limits of reason, and showing the way by which men may please God and secure his blessings." Its right interpretation is made to rest upon "its vital relations to the great system of divine revelation and to Christ himself, the central figure of that system." Its unmistakable Christological character is accordingly recognized, without assuming "such definite references to the accidents as distinguished from the essentials of Christ's kingdom as we may look for and find in the specifically prophetic Scriptures." "Its typology is not very closely related to either the historical facts or the instituted ordinances of the Church, in either its Levitical or Christian development, and its Christology is of the spirit and not of the letter." "Even the great truths of mediation, and of redemption by price, and of the future life, though not wholly absent, are here presented only dimly, and without either explicit declarations or definite outlines." Neither the visions of Isaiah nor the clear sunlight of the gospels should "be foisted" into the faithful interpretation of the Book of Job.

A clear illustration of these considerations is afforded in the exposition of the familiar and greatly misunderstood passage, chap. 19: 25-27, "I know that my redeemer liveth, &c.," an exposition which also exemplifies the masterful exegetical tact, clear insight and sound, conservative judgment of Dr. Curry. The authorized version here confessedly reads into the sacred text a sentiment which the original entirely fails to sustain. The translation of the revisers is accepted as coming "as near to being entirely satisfactory as the case will admit of," and the

modification of the American Committee is regarded as "not contradictory to that in the text, but as giving its more precise meaning."

"There is perhaps some element of truth in the traditional interpretation of this passage, notwithstanding the violence that it does to the text. The whole book is, like all other parts of the Old Testament, full of the Christian element, but its Christology is indirect and in some sense occult. Some of its passages may even seem to be unconscious prophecies of the future Redeemer—the GOEL of the whole race of mankind. God here appears in his twofold character and relations, the Vindicator of his own law and the Redeemer of his people—and Job's appeal is from the former to the latter. And when he thought that his death was inevitable he still believed that, after his body should be destroyed, God would yet appear to vindicate him."

This Commentary will undoubtedly be recognized as a real contribution to biblical science and scholars have great reason to regret that they cannot expect other volumes to issue from the same source. To the great loss of the Church here Dr. Curry has been called to the Church above.

*Das Alte Testament bei Johannes.* Ein Beitrag zur Erklärung und Beurtheilung der johanneischen Schriften Von Lic. A. H. Franke. Privat-docent in Halle. Göttingen: Vanderhoeck & Ruprecht's Verlag. 1885.

This volume treats critically and thoroughly the central issue of the Johannine question, namely, the authenticity of the fourth gospel. The attacks made on this gospel within the last decade, under the leadership of the Tübingen school of Baur, proceed from the premises that more or less this gospel is anti-Judaistic and antagonizes the Old Testament as a divine revelation. This problem it is which Franke investigates, with the conclusion, that a fair examination of the contents of this gospel does not admit of this judgment, and that accordingly there is no need of placing its date at the close of the second Christian century, when really such an anti-Judaistic tendency prevailed in some sections of the Church.

In the method and manner in which this intricate and important critical problem is elucidated, Franke evinces the spirit of typical German specialism. His materials have been carefully collected, carefully sifted and utilized. Even if the reader cannot in every case accept the conclusions offered, yet he cannot but be grateful for the wealth of materials for further study and research which this volume gives him. It is one of those useful manuals which enables the student to form an independent judgment in regard to the problems under discussion.

*The Psalms in English Verse.* By Abraham Coles, M. D., LL. D. pp. 296 with 68 pp. of Notes, Critical, Historical and Biographical, in-

cluding an Historical sketch of the French, English and Scotch metrical Versions. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1888.

Dr. Coles is already favorably known by his "Dies Irae," *In Thirteen Original Versions*, and by his translations of famous Latin Hymns under the title "Old Gems in New Settings."

The introduction to this present work is well-written and is crowded with historical data. The book is well worth having for this rich collection of notes.

When we come to the metrical portion, we cannot speak so confidently. There is versatility of talent, easy and flowing rhythm, but failure to reproduce the strength and beauty of the Hebrew. Over and over again accuracy is surrendered to the exactions of rhythm. It is probable that it may be necessary, but it is not satisfactory. A confused difficulty has always been conceded in the translation of poems from one language to another. Even Longfellow often fails to worthily reproduce in English the Italian of Dante. The Hebrew offers greater difficulty and in these metrical translations its rugged strength and axiomatic brevity are sacrificed for melodious smoothness and "linked sweetness long drawn out." To those who desire the Psalms in English verse there is offered no better version than that which is here presented. The author, under the limitations above, has placed the lovers of the Psalms in this form under a debt of gratitude.

*The Book of Genesis.* By Marcus Dods, D. D., Author of "Israel's Iron Age," "The Parables of our Lord," etc. 8vo. pp. 445.

*The First Book of Samuel.* By the Rev. Professor W. G. Blaikie, D. D., LL. D. 8vo pp. 440.

*The Gospel according to St. Mark.* By the Very Rev. G. A. Chadwick, D. D., Dean of Armagh, Author of "Christ Bearing Witness to Himself," etc. 8vo. pp. 446.

The April issue of the *QUARTERLY* contained a notice of the "Expositor's Bible," edited by the Rev. W. Robertson Nicoll, reprinted by A. C. Armstrong & Son, New York, and on sale by the J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia. Three more volumes of the series are now before us, illustrating not only the promptness of the publishers but the meritorious character of this contribution to our expository literature. Notwithstanding our high estimate of the standard critical commentaries, it is really refreshing to exchange them sometimes for a work like this, which with great force gives the marrow of the sacred oracles, instead of the minute and dreary disquisitions of grammar, philology, textual criticism and allied subjects. These very often do not minister to edification any more than the study of mathematics or of Sanscrit, while the series of Expository Lectures now appearing aims at employing the Scriptures for the practical ends of life and salvation. It is

not behind modern scholarship, but it is essentially popular in style and adapted to the home library of the general reader as well as to the bookshelves of the clergy.

In the Book of Genesis Dr. Dods expatiates on the salient themes of Creation, The Fall, Cain and Abel, The Flood, and so on to the Blessing of the Tribes in the closing chapter, and disposes of the difficulties that have arisen in connection with the interpretation of those earliest records in a way that fastens their spiritual truths in the mind while the reader forgets the technical questions that have been raised. This is a master stroke of biblical exposition. The Bible is something more than a museum of antiquities. It is still to supply light and life to the world.

Prof. Blaikie is always fresh and strong. His volume on I. Samuel in this series (another on II. Samuel will follow shortly) will rank as one of the best products of his prolific pen. Combining a thorough mastery of the historical contents of Samuel with orthodox views and an evangelical spirit, he keeps his eye on the every-day aspects of life and makes a cogent application of the sacred narrative to our present wants and duties. The preacher rather than the commentator appears to be speaking, or better it is the voice of the preacher expounding Scripture, and this volume like the others of the series is really a succession of expository discourses, rich in thought, clothed in a delightful style and marked by direct and pungent address. It would be hard to find a better model of expository preaching, and that is the kind of preaching most needed in the present period.

All this is true likewise of Dean Chadwick's Lectures on Mark, where our admiration is divided between the author's clear insight into the truth and the brilliant eloquence with which the enforces it upon his readers. We can wish for nothing more than that the volumes yet to appear will come up to the high mark which has been set by the four volumes already issued. We see room for just such a work and the different authors to whom the volumes have been respectively assigned show thus far an instructive appreciation of those features which will make the publication a success. And the publishers are not to be outdone by the authors. The heavy white paper, clear and full-faced type and handsome binding add no little to the attractiveness and value of the series which we predict will have a wide-spread demand alike from laity and clergy.

*What is the Bible?* An Inquiry into the Origin and Nature of the Old and New Testaments in the light of Modern Biblical Study. By George T. Ladd, D. D. Professor of Philosophy in Yale University. pp. 497. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons.

Over and over again, as the author truly says, has it been falsely and foolishly declared that faith would totter and fall if certain scientific and critical conclusions, imagined to be antagonistic to the Bible, should

be established. But the right distinction between the truth of the Bible and the truth of certain theories about the Bible will, in all such cases, finally establish itself. Indeed, no other proof of the inspiration of Holy Scripture is on the whole more impressive than just this wonderful power of adapting its important claims to all the developments of human knowledge. And the Church owes a large debt of gratitude to scholars like Dr. Ladd, who combine with advanced learning the independence and courage to maintain that the assured results of modern biblical science are not incompatible with faith in the Bible as the only authentic and sufficient source of saving truth.

The author's elaborate and exhaustive work on "The Doctrine of Sacred Scripture" is not unknown to our readers. That is a work for specialists. The volume before us now presents the conclusions of that treatise in a form better adapted to the wants of the multitude of readers of the English Bible. It is a popular answer to the inquiries which have occupied the scholarship of the age concerning the origin and nature of the Bible.

The purpose of this book is professedly apologetic. We have no doubt that it is written in the interest of the faith, and that to many it will prove a tonic. Yet others again, drinking in unwisely or immaturity some of its teachings, will doubtless grow weaker under it. This is perhaps inevitable. These subjects have to be met, the perversion of certain theories must be forestalled, the reconciliation of new truths with old ones must be effected, and though a reverent and conservative writer like Dr. Ladd is all the time guarding his readers against wrong inferences, teaching them carefully to discriminate, and pointing out avenues of escape from confessed difficulties, yet the not infrequent readiness to yield to doubt where religious difficulties arise can hardly be provided against by the most judicious discussion.

The spirit and trend of this work, which maintains substantially the conclusions of the larger work published five years ago, are fully brought out in the chapter on Miracles.

A miracle is a species of the supernatural; it is a particular mode of the manifestation of Himself, which God makes in external nature to the mind of man. Such revelation implies that something takes place by the act of God, outside of the human mind, which is designed and adapted to make the divine nature and work known to man. But it also implies that a spiritual process of apprehending the meaning of what thus takes place externally, goes on in the mind itself. Revelation cannot be a mechanical process; it cannot be a kind of carrying over ready-made the truths of one mind to the mind of another.

The Bible never represents its miraculous occurrences as though they came about in an absolutely supernatural or wholly arbitrary way. Even miracles are always limited by conditions derived from nature. The conception of the miracle which seems to be required by the teaching



of both the Old and New Testaments includes three elements: 1. A miracle is *not* an event of ordinary experience. 2. It *is* the product of God's immediate presence and activity. 3. It is a *sign*, proof or reminder to men which has a moral and religious significance. Biblical miracles are factors in that system of divine self-revelation, which it is the chief function of the Bible to record, perpetuate, explain and apply. They are organically connected with the process of divine revelation. They have a moral significance and sustain relations of the greatest interest and value to the development of the kingdom of God.

There can be no doubt, says the author, that Jesus claimed to work miracles. And this to him as to all Christian believers is final. Nor can a truly *miraculous* character be denied to those cures of the sick which he performed almost daily. The miraculous element is inseparable from the gospel. The supernatural personality of Christ is itself the most stupendous central miracle of the New Testament revelation. This indestructible centre forms accordingly the starting point for examining the evidence for the other biblical miracles. They are to be regarded in the light of the relation they sustain to the entire self-revelation of God as the Redeemer of man, and it is claimed that whatever may be the fate of such Old-Testament narratives, the firm centre of truth about the person and work of Jesus is not in the least disturbed.

This may be so, but the author does not demonstrate it. If that ax did not swim, if Samson did not possess miraculous strength, if Jonah is a myth, it may easily be said "these questions do not *essentially* concern our faith in Christ," but if this be so, an author of Dr. Ladd's ability ought to be able to make it perfectly clear to his readers.

If the authors of the Old Testament books put on record a series of fabulous stories, what becomes of their inspiration. And if inspiration is not infallibility and does not claim to guarantee "infallibility of any kind," what is the value of it? If "*specifically* considered, it is the same illumining, quickening, elevating and purifying work which goes on in the entire community of believing souls," if "every Christian is inspired," why should we put implicit faith in the writings of the prophets or the apostles any more than in the clever productions of Dr. Ladd?

It occurs to us that our author in common with many others fails to make proper distinctions when he speaks of Luther's position on the infallibility of the Scriptures. That Luther doubted the canonicity of certain books is known to every student of history, but that he ever in the least degree impugned the trustworthiness of any portion of Scripture which he believed to be the product of inspiration, we have never discovered anywhere. A question of Canon ought not to be confounded with one of Inspiration.

We feel constrained also to question the statement, p. 412, that "just so far as the writers of the history appreciate the meaning of what they record, their record becomes something more than a mere record of the

history of revelation; it becomes itself a revelation." That the organs of revelation comprehended at the time the significance of what they were writing, is a statement not only in direct conflict with 1 Pet. 1: 10-12, but wholly incompatible with the principle of a progressive development in revelation. The testimony of the prophets far transcended their individual consciousness. They builded better than they knew.

We have found this volume one of absorbing interest, but we are confident and glad that it is not the final work to be spoken on its momentous theme.

*The Bible Doctrine of Inspiration Explained and Vindicated.* By Basil Manly, D. D., LL. D., Professor in the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary, Louisville, Ky. With complete Indexes. pp. 266. 12mo. Cloth, \$1.25. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.

To pass from Dr. Ladd's work noticed above to the volume in hand is like a sudden change of climate to a traveler. The atmosphere is charged with quite different elements. Dr. Miley is a staunch representative of the old view, which Dr. Ladd's learned volumes are intended to overthrow. His position is that the Bible is truly the word of God, having both infallible truth and divine authority in all that it affirms or enjoins. He presents clearly and fairly the various counter views of the more lax or liberal schools of thought, but his own thinking has evidently not in the least been affected by them.

The work is characterized by simplicity of analysis and careful distinctions and will be welcomed as a brief and lucid, if not exhaustive summary of the views on Inspiration held by the most representative of American and European schools. The author's view is given more fully in the form of negative statements of the doctrine, and he in fact declines to offer any theory of Inspiration. "The question is one of fact, not of theory. The Scriptures omit to give any theory, any account of the mode of inspiration, any explanation of the phenomenon. They assert it as a fact; they do not tell how it was accomplished. Upon the supposition that it is supernatural, it is impossible that there should be any legitimate or adequate theory of it devised by human intellect." Every supernatural phenomenon is above explanation, and both revelation and inspiration are such, just as really as the multiplication of the five loaves, or the turning of the water into wine.

The Proofs of Inspiration and the Objections to it form the burden of the volume, and they are handled with learning, skill and force.

The printer's part in this book is exceptionally good. In fact the publications of the Armstrongs generally excel in this feature.

*The Law and Limitation of Our Lord's Miracles.* A Semi-Centennial Discourse delivered before the Central New York Conference of the

M. E. Church, Oct. 11, 1887. By Daniel Dana Buck, D. D. pp. 76. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

Rarely has so much truth been compressed into so small a compass as in this discourse, the basis for which is Mark 6: 5, "And he could there do no mighty work," &c.

At Nazareth the energies of the infinite seemed to be fettered. Something in the finite successfully withstood the infinite. The less overcame the greater. What means the "could not" that successfully hindered the outgoings of divine mercy? Does it still exist anywhere? Is unbelief in these days as effectually fatal as it was in those days? This finite hindrance must be moral in its development. It does not change the disposition of divinity, nor does it overpower almightiness. It must be a moral impediment originating with men and fatally affecting relative conditions. The "could not" is that of unsuitableness; the impossibility of impropriety.

The impediment is of such a nature, and the conditions affected by it of such a kind, that to interfere by a forceful removal of the impediment, or an irresistible alteration of relative conditions, would involve still greater impropriety, and in its ultimate effects would be less beneficial to mankind than to let things remain as they are.

Solid and suggestive material like this characterizes the sermon throughout.

## II. THEOLOGICAL.

*The System of Theology* contained in the Westminster Shorter Catechism. Opened and Explained. Part I. Belief Concerning God. By Rev. A. A. Hodge, D. D. Part II. Duty Required of Man. By J. Aspinwall Hodge, D. D. pp. 190 New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. On sale by J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.

Theology is not yet obsolete. And the Catechism where for a time it seemed to be discarded is again claiming its place as a powerful agency for Christian instruction. There is, indeed, an increasing desire to know what are the doctrines of Christianity as revealed in the word of God. Laymen, as well as ministers, are recognizing the necessity of having clear views of God's plan of salvation, and of being able to impart them to others. It was to quicken and satisfy this demand, to popularize theology, that this volume was prepared. And no one more suitable for such task could have been found in our country than the lamented Dr. A. A. Hodge, who combined a thorough mastery of the doctrines of salvation with an uncommon talent for setting them forth in a popular and attractive form.

His sudden death left the work incomplete and Part I. alone is from his pen. His cousin has carried his plan in Part II., and so far as we

have examined it he falls but little below his distinguished kinsman in clear analysis and lucid statement.

The appearance of this work is most timely. A dearth of this kind of literature has been followed naturally by theological leanness and it is time that we once more have some solid food and that in a digestible form.

There is no occasion for shunning this volume on the ground of denominationalism. It is worthy of a cordial reception by all denominations—for, of course, no book is published whose teachings are in every point expected to be universally acceptable. Our readers, we are confident, will find this exposition of a historic catechism exceptionally helpful, and they will be surprised to see how closely a large proportion of its teachings corresponds with and confirms their own views. A sounder, fuller, clearer exhibition of the doctrine of justification they would look for vainly in the copious literature of Lutheran Dogmatics.

A Calvinistic author who takes pains to-day to remind his readers that the word "exhibit" used in connection with the doctrine of the Sacraments in the Confession of Faith and in the Larger Catechism is from the Latin *exhibere* meaning "to administer, confer, or apply," who defines the efficacy of the sacraments as "their ability to communicate to us Christ and the benefits of redemption," and who specifies regeneration and sanctification as the benefits of baptism, is not likely to prove on many points an unsafe teacher to those of the Lutheran household of faith. The discussion of the Lord's Supper is of course far from satisfactory—it takes Zwinglian ground rather than Calvinistic. The wine used in the Passover and at the institution of the Supper it is claimed was the fermented juice of the grape and "we are not at liberty to substitute any other liquid for wine in this ordinance."

*The Religious Aspect of Evolution.* The Bedell Lectures, 1887. By James McCosh, D. D., LL. D., Litt. D. President of Princeton College. 4to. pp. 109. New York and London: G. P. Putnam's Sons.

Dr. McCosh possesses the reverence and faith of a theologian along with the freedom and progressiveness of a scientist, and one cannot read this little volume without getting a good deal both of science and of theology. What is especially commendable is that the two provinces are clearly distinguished, and the author with a master's devotion to both is careful to show what questions are reserved for science to settle and what are the proper problems for theology.

Dr. McCosh, it is well known, accepts the general theory of evolution. He has no objection to "the primordial kinship of all organisms." The appearance of man is not altogether an anomaly, an exception to universal evolution, albeit "a creation of something new." "It is one of a series the highest of the series." To the question whether man's body has come from a brute, this eminent and honest thinker modestly an-

swers "I know not. I believe in revelation, I believe in science, but neither has revealed this to me; and I restrain the weak curiosity which would tempt me to inquire into what cannot be known. Meanwhile I am sure, and I assert, that man's soul is of a higher origin and of a nobler type."

No one laying any claims in our day to intelligence can content himself with total ignorance on the great question of evolution and we know of no work that can more safely be commended to general readers than this reverent, lucid, conservative, and very entertaining discussion.

*The Unity of the Truth in Christianity and Evolution.* By J. Max Hark, D. D. pp. 290. New York: J. B. Alden.

It will be observed at once by the title that this volume is kin to the one from Dr. McCosh just noticed. Not only the subject but the positions are to some extent identical. The author does not enjoy the fame of the great ex-President of Princeton, and he does not speak with the authority which goes with the work of a writer whose ability and learning are universally recognized. But he has written a very readable book and one that gives evidence of sufficient acquaintance with specialists to point out both their undoubted results and their notable inconsistencies. As a specimen of the latter it is quite interesting to see him show up Huxley, Tyndal and Darwin maintaining on the one hand that "nothing farther can be known of the Ultimate Reality than that it exists," and on the other hand ascribing various attributes to the Unknown. The Great Unknown is after all "known as a cause." It is defined as "in every sense perfect, complete, total," almighty—"including within itself all power," eternal and omnipresent—"we are unable to think of limits to the presence of this power."

Dr. Hark holds that atheism and materialism are forever rendered impossible by Evolution, that Evolution is inconsistent with agnosticism and that the Evolutionist and the Christian can alike believe. That the tenets of Evolution and the doctrines of Scripture can be made to harmonize in great part, is not to be doubted but it does not follow, we think, that the one as a system of thought is entirely compatible with the other system of thought—any more than Heathen religions may be said to coincide with Christianity because they have much in common with it. Here will be found, no doubt, the error of Christian Evolutionists. When they shall have shown the "Unity of the Truth in Evolution and Christianity" on such general topics as God, Providence, Man, Sin and Salvation, there still remain a number of vital doctrines which no one has been bold enough to maintain as consonant with the claims of Evolution.

And the argument for Unity breaks down in the very subjects to which it is most confidently applied. Our author would have his reader think that the scriptural account of the origin of Sin can be harmonized

with the hypothesis of the evolution of man. But what sort of harmony is this? In the one case man disobeyed God's clearly understood commandment and by this became morally guilty and sinful. In the other case, "in that grand progress which is bearing humanity onward to a higher intelligence and nobler character, he became conscious of right and wrong, and of the obligation to do the one and avoid the other." The one case involves moral deterioration, the other is a moral advance, and we have the idea so often expressed by Mr. Beecher that every "fall has been a fall upward."

We cannot agree with our genial author in all the concessions he makes to Evolution nor in his estimate of the service which this hypothesis renders to theology. We cannot accept it as another revelation, superior to the old one so far at least that it becomes the interpreter of those inspired oracles which have so long either puzzled or misled the human mind. While admitting that some theological beliefs have retreated before the advance of scientific research, the exploded theories of science would fill vast libraries. History does not warrant us in accepting Evolution as the final science. In the meanwhile, we hold it to be very unwise to antagonize the old theology in general as if it were the embodiment of error, superstition and tyranny. The God of the old theology, with moral attributes and a Father's heart, the God possessing "intelligence and will, feelings, purposes, thoughts, and motives" such as we must conceive of through the dim outlines expressed in human personality, commands our adoration and faith incomparably more than the God of the Evolutionist, whom we know only "as one being, and as absolutely free and self-determining spirit." Dr. Hark differs herein from the writer, and whilst he unquestionably knows a good deal of Evolution, and has written concerning it in elegant rhetoric and at times in outbursts of genuine eloquence, we regret to find in his book, as in so many others, a virtual casting aside of the Bible under the delusion that a certain bold hypothesis leads to a fuller, clearer view of the divine truth.

*Von den Letzten Dingen.* Von Gerhard Uhlhorn, Bodo Sievers und Rudolf Steinmetz. pp. 78, 8vo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht's Verlag.

This pamphlet contains four lectures on eschatology, a subject of special interest just at present. Two of them, the first, on The History and Importance of the Doctrine; and the third, on Purgatory, are by the wellknown Abt of Loccum, one of the most scholarly Lutheran theologians in Germany. The second, on Death in the Light of the Divine Word, is by Superintendent Sievers in Gross Berkel, and the last, on Life in the Future World, by Dr. Steinmetz, of Göttingen. The style of treatment is popular, as the lectures were prepared for audiences of thoughtful hearers in the city of Hanover. They are accordingly not

exegetical but didactic, and, with the exception of the third, only to a limited extent polemical. The spirit and teachings are in accord with the Lutheran confessions. Uhlhorn's are especially good, being characterized by the singular suggestive nature of all his writings. While the lectures do not contain anything that is new, they present the subject from new sides and thus aid in fully understanding the difficult subject under discussion. They contain good material that the preacher could use.

*Current Discussions in Theology.* By the Professors of Chicago Theological Seminary. Vol. V. pp. 404. Boston and Chicago: Congregational Sunday-School and Publishing Society.

There ought to be amongst us a large demand for a work of this character—the only one of its kind, so far as we know, in the English language. It is indeed, intended mainly for scholars, but are not scholars rapidly multiplying in this country? Their use of this Annual will in fact serve as a good test of men's scholarship. It takes them to the summit of Theological Science and gives them some idea of the vastness of the horizon that bounds this realm of thought. Many we surmise will be appalled as they discover the extent of what is done in the different fields of sacred learning within a twelve-month. The literary year under review in this volume extends about from June to June, and the investigations accordingly terminate with midsummer 1887.

The faculty of the Chicago Seminary have made a division of their labors in these discussions corresponding to their respective chairs. The Present State of Old Testament Studies is reviewed by Prof. Samuel Ives Curtiss, who has in this field probably no peer in this country. New Testament Studies is by Prof. G. H. Gilbert. The Most Recent Studies in Church History With Some of the Most Important Results, by Rev. Hugh M. Scott. Systematic Theology, Theism, Apologetics and Ethics by Prof. George N. Boardman. Pastoral Theology by Rev. G. B. Wilcox, and Homiletics by Rev. F. W. Fisk.

The disproportion between German and Anglo-Saxon literature in this domain will be a surprise to those who have not been aware to what degree both English and American theologians draw their material from the great German masters. If undue prominence is given to recent German works, and especially to radical teachings and criticisms from that quarter, it is because they are in a much larger measure productive in this province than recognized teachers in this country and in England. The authors candidly disclaim sympathy with theological novelties but they do not propose to themselves the task of defending or refuting any particular school, but rather to report to their readers the lines along which the most active investigations have been recently conducted and to note principally the deviations from the beaten path that have been made, the new tendencies that have developed and the latest results claimed.



Along with eminent learning the authors are to be commended for the spirit of fairness and candor that permeates their work, a feature which we the more readily commend in the recollection of some strictures on this point we felt constrained to utter in the notice of a former volume. We sincerely hope that these "Current Discussions" will be continued and we assure our readers that no one who desires to keep abreast of the times can afford to do without the work.

*Philosophy and Religion.* A series of Addresses, Essays and Sermons designed to set forth Great Truths in Popular Form. By Augustus Hopkins Strong, D. D., President and Professor of Biblical Theology in the Rochester Theological Seminary. Large octavo. pp. 632. \$3.50. Uniform with the author's "Systematic Theology." New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. On sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Philadelphia.

Dr. Strong is a thinker of marked independence and power, not affected by the fashionable trend of the times and quite capable of holding his own on the lines of conservatism and orthodoxy. In regard to Evolution, for instance, while it is a fascinating system, he maintains with a logic which is not easily confuted, that it is destructive of morality, that it cannot give a satisfactory explanation of life, and that it fails to account for mind, for soul, for Christ, as it fails also to account for *a priori* knowledge.

The solid octavo before us is a collection of essays and discussions on the great philosophical, theological, educational and literary questions of the day, such as "Science and Religion," "Materialistic Skepticism," "Philosophy and Evolution," "Modern Idealism," "Scientific Theism," "The Will in Theology," "Modified Calvinism," "Miracles," "The New Theology," "Inspiration," "Supply of the Ministry," "Education for the Ministry," "The Economics of Missions," "Re-Marriage after Divorce," "The Crusades." It touches thus almost every burning issue and treats them with masterful force and in an attractive popular form, so that men of general culture as well as students and specialists will appreciate these discussions, which certainly merit the widest circulation. No one accustomed to thought and inquiry on these vital topics can follow the author's treatment of them without being greatly aided in grappling them and in apprehending and holding the truth. A full index gives to this large volume almost the character of a library on modern thought.

### III. HISTORICAL.

*Christianity in the United States*, from the First Settlement down to the Present Time. By Daniel Dorchester, D. D. pp. 795. 8vo. Price \$4.50. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

Here is a book which ought to be in the hands of every intelligent

American. To the educated Christian ministry it will be found invaluable if not indispensable. It is an orderly array of facts which have been of momentous import in the discovery, settlement and development of our country, and the interests alike of patriotism and of religion invest its pages with uncommon fascination. The author's reputation for thoroughness and fairness was established by previous contributions to our religious history. The reader, therefore, who is not specially familiar with this province need not be constantly interrupted with attempts to verify any statements that may startle him as he passes from page to page. Besides, there are ample footnotes giving authorities and satisfactory explanations of points in controversy.

The work is divided into: I. The Colonial Era; II. The National Era. Under the latter it gives Period I. From 1776 to 1800. Period II. From 1800 to 1850. Period III. From 1850 to 1887. It is not an attempt to write the history of the various religious denominations, but rather a bird's-eye view of the field on which are marshalled the three great competing forces in the religious life of the nation, Protestantism, Romanism, and a variety of divergent elements.

Even minds that are not specially occupied with religious ideas can not fail to be struck with the paramount position which Christianity asserted in the earliest period of our history, and the primary and powerful inspiration it gave both to the original discovery and to the colonial settlement. It was under "the solemn benediction of the Church" that Columbus conceived and achieved his great purpose. With his fellow adventurers he set sail from Palos immediately after a deeply impressive service of the Holy Communion, and the first sight of the new world was greeted with a *Gloria in Excelsis*, while the first landing witnessed Columbus on his knees, with tears of joy giving thanks to God. On his second voyage he was accompanied by a band of missionaries. Others soon followed in the same holy cause, and in a brief period these servants of the cross had extended their labors among the Indians from the coast of Florida to the slopes of the Pacific. The ascendancy of the religious principle in the Protestant colonies, founded about a century later, was so strong that the governments established by them were virtual theocracies, a fact which is not disproved by restricting the term to its literal meaning or by denying a direct revelation to the first New Englanders.

On the subject of intolerance honors are evenly divided between Roman Catholics and Protestants, between the Episcopalians of Virginia and the Congregationalists of Massachusetts and, we may add, the Reformed of New York. All were ready to hang Quakers, to burn witches, to fine and imprison dissenters, and as rule to exclude papists. Maryland alone was an exception, having "adopted a strong statutory declaration in favor of religious liberty." Here "Roman Catholics and Protestants alike found protection and security, and lived in harmony."

But as this forms such a contrast not only to the course of the other colonies, but to the spirit of the age, which knew nothing of religious equality before the law, the author is at pains to show that this remarkable Roman Catholic liberality in Maryland could not have been "a purely voluntary thing." "The Blue Laws of Connecticut" he pronounces "legendary," having "never existed except in the imagination of their originator," and in this he voices doubtless the verdict of history.

The author's position that the failure to acknowledge God in the National Constitution was due to "the subtle poison of French philosophy, vitiating the perception of its framers," is unhistoric, and is, besides, an unjust personal imputation. Many of the most earnest Christians of that day as well as this, believed that it was best alike for the Church and the State that their provinces should be kept entirely separate. The Massachusetts Convention which adopted the Constitution was made up largely of clergymen, and a religious amendment was offered, which it was expected these would unanimously support, but they voted against it almost to a man. They had had a century and a half of "theocratic" rule and found it not well adapted to a free, popular government. As the author well states, and this is better than formal acknowledgment: "The national heart has been wiser, deeper, and nearer to God than the letter of the Constitution."

Maps, charts, diagrams and statistical tables add much to the completeness of the volume, which closes with a cheering chapter reviewing the pending problems which confront our religious and national situation, and representing the outlook as full of encouragement. "This nation is the happy heir of modern history. The current of our national life broadens, deepens, and speeds on with increasing swiftness. Check it we would not, master it we cannot, but guide it we may. And who will think it less noble because it has some sediment at the bottom, or bears some wrecks on its surface, or leaves some ruins on its shores?"

*Studies on the Religious Problem of our Country.* A Review of the Growth of the Church of Christ in Numbers, Wealth and Good Works, Contrasted with the Growth of our Country in Population, Wealth and Vice. By Rev. Milton H. Stine, A. M. pp. 170. York, Pa.: Lutheran Printing House.

This is a maiden effort and as such is not without merit. The young author has faithfully applied his own gifts and has made diligent use of materials furnished by others in the same field. He treats successively: The Condition of our Country's Development Before and at the Beginning of the Present Century; Our Growth in Territory—Our Development of Natural Resources—Our Manufactories and Growth in Wealth; The Rapid Growth of the Church in the United States in Comparison with the Growth of Population; Amount of Money Expended in Church

Erection in Different Periods; The Work of the Church of to-day of our Country contrasted with her Work in Early Years; Development of the Church (continued); The Sunday School, Y. M. C. A., &c.; Intemperance; Sabbath Desecration; Romanism, &c.

This indicates the general drift of the work. Its spirit is earnest, patriotic and full of Christian hope. We trust it may find a large circle of readers.

*History of Prussia under Frederick the Great.* 2 Vols. 1740-1745, 1745-1756. By Herbert Tuttle, Professor in Cornell University. pp. 308, 334. \$4.50. Boston & New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Company. On sale by J. B. Lippincott Co.

We have here another confirmation of the truth, which is gaining recognition abroad as well as among our own scholars, that European History is to be written by American authors. To the famous contributions in this sphere, of Prescott, Motley, and Baird, Tuttle's History of Prussia makes a very worthy addition.

The first volume of this series, "History of Prussia to the accession of Fredrick the Great," which gives the antecedents of the great king and the inherited forces and problems of his reign, was noticed in the QUARTERLY of April 1884. The two volumes before us closing with the outbreak of the "Seven Years' War," form "the first half of what it is hoped will be a complete account, descriptive and historical, of the reign of the third King of Prussia." The fourth volume, to be issued in the near future, will cover the period of the Seven Years' War, and the fifth will bring the story down to the death of Frederick.

The work when completed will accordingly cover the ground of Carlyle's great history, but the two works are similar only in this one respect, that they have the same subject. And even here they differ. For while the noisy hero-worshiper keeps the reader's mind fixed upon his idol Frederick, the sober American writer, with the instincts of the American mind, depicts the life of Prussia as a state, the development of her polity and the growth of her institutions. Carlyle's romantic and bombastic volumes have at all events been seriously discredited of late, so that whilst the reader may miss those fascinating personal details, which make Frederick's history singularly picturesque, he will have much greater confidence in the truthfulness of the narrative, and also greater interest in it as a serious student of the development of a great kingdom.

Professor Tuttle has evidently expended labor and pains on the preparation of this work. He was for a long time resident in Berlin and applied himself to the mastery of a vast, confused and conflicting literature bearing on his subject. To the extreme difficulty of such a task he brought thorough scholarship, critical judgment and masterly skill,

and the result is a clear and comprehensive delineation of the Prussian State during the reign of the greatest predecessor of Kaiser Wilhelm. The style is luminous, direct and vigorous, perhaps not sufficiently rhetorical to be popular, but sure to be appreciated by those whose main concern is to gain historical knowledge of that country which to-day holds the German Empire under the sceptre of its illustrious dynasty, and under the guidance of its statesmen controls the destinies of Europe. No library is complete without these volumes, whose mechanical execution, by the way, is of the highest order.

*The Aryan Race: Its Origin and its Achievements.* By Charles Morris, author of "A Manual of Classical Literature," pp. 347. \$1.50. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co.

Under the successive titles of *The Home of the Aryans*, *The Aryan Outflow*, *The Household and the Village*, *The Double System of Aryan Worship*, *The Course of Political Development*, *The Aryan Literature*, etc., this monograph discusses in an interesting form the peculiarities of that race which has filled so large a space in the history of human progress. One is indeed somewhat vexed by the constant recurrence of such phrases as "perhaps," "doubtful," "possible," "probable," "apparently," "seems to," "obscure traces" and the like, indicating the amount of conjecture and speculation which attaches to the pre-historic phases of these subjects. But then how much more satisfactory, after all, is the modest and candid tone of such a writer than the wild assumptions of those who are so cock-sure of everything. We have experienced peculiar interest in the account of the two distinct systems of the Aryan worship, the worship of ancestors and the deific mythology, the home worship and that of the elements or gods, the rites conducted by the house-priest and those imposed by the priestly order, the one tending to democracy the other to aristocracy, the one absorbed in man the other in the gods. The absence of a priesthood to contend for the ancient religion is assigned as the reason that Christianity made such rapid progress with the Teutonic tribes. "There was no one with a strong interest in preserving the mythologic faith, no one to control the tribes in matters of belief, no earnest clings to the deities of mythology." The main worship was paid to the deities of the household on whom alone the affections were centred. The slight hold of a mythologic faith upon the western Aryans, and the lack of an organized and influential priesthood to develop the public worship and to create a strong sentiment in its favor, are held to account for the easy inflow of a foreign system of belief throughout the west, and for the rapid progress of Christianity "with scarcely a word of protest or opposition until the political danger from Christianity roused the dread of the emperors."

*A Short History of the English People.* By John Richard Green. With Maps and Tables. New Edition, Thoroughly Revised. pp. 872. 8vo. New York: Harper & Brothers.

One of the most charming books in the English language is Green's *Short History of the English People*. Instead of seizing the conspicuous subjects which historians usually employ as the essential features of their works, to wit, kings and heroes, battles and conquests, Mr. Green lectures on social advance in which we read the history of the nation itself. War, he holds, plays a small part in the real story of European nations, and in that of England its part is smaller than that of any. With such an idea of history Mr. Green combined great earnestness of purpose, a firm grasp of his subject, tireless industry and a dignity, beauty and vivacity of style that holds the reader as with a spell. No wonder that the work soon after its first issue, attained uncommon popularity. It is certainly the most readable and the most instructive history of the English people that has yet been written.

Mrs. Green having been the literary help-mate of her husband in the composition of the original edition and having received his dying charge for a revision, the present volume is the result. She has made no changes with the plan or structure of the book and has altered its order but little. A few corrections were found necessary and she has been mainly guided throughout by the work of revision done by Mr. Green himself on his larger *History*.

*Palestine in the Time of Christ.* By Edmund Stapfer, D. D. Third Edition with Maps and Plans. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son.

The translation of this important work is very well done so far as easy and translucent English is concerned. Its accuracy we are not able to vouch for as the original is not before us. The volume itself is charmingly and strongly written. It is a mine of information concerning Palestine in the time of Christ. It treats in the first book of the Social Life and in the second, of the Religious Life of His Day. Under the first, the Geography, the Rulers, the Sanhedrim, Administration of Justice, Population, Home Life, Dwellings, Clothing, Public Life, Literature the Arts, and Science are discussed. Under the second, Pharisees and Sadducees, Hillel and Shammai, Doctors of the Law, Philosophy, Preaching, the Synagogue, the Sabbath, the Bible, Religious Observances, the Temple, the Feasts, the Essenes, Jesus and the Preaching of the Gospel are discussed.

All of these are handled in the light of the most recent discoveries and criticisms. The author, with French vivacity, is always clear and, whilst well-informed and working in the cold, clear light of intellect, oftentimes settles disputed points with an easy assurance which the facts

do not warrant. Thus his statements concerning the ready cure of leprosy, the manner of demon-possession are clear but not conclusive.

Many of his observations are exceedingly acute and suggestive, as for example the fine criticism concerning the Jewish mind and taste in fine arts and literature. We quote one sentence, "The Jews, as a rule, are indifferent to beauty of detail. That which is refined, delicate, pretty, escapes them; they are only impressed by that which is on a vast and overpowering scale."

He is inclined to concede too much, we think, at times to the advanced criticism of the day, though his conclusions are entirely against this school. His remarks concerning Hillel, page 290, are worthy of consideration, the more so as earlier he believed that Hillel was the master of Jesus, a conclusion which his profounder study entirely rejects. The last chapter has occasioned much adverse criticism among the rationalistic school, for in this, the author clearly sets forth that Jesus, however the human nature was assimilated to the divine, was the Son of God.

The book is admirable in conception, in faithfulness and in minute and extensive scholarship. We may add that the work of the printer and the binder is tastefully performed.

C. S. A.

*A History of the Inquisition of the Middle Ages.* By Henry Charles Lea, author of "An Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy," "Studies in Church History," etc. In three volumes. Vols. II. and III. 8vo. pp. 587, 736. New York: Harper & Brothers.

These two volumes of Mr. Lea's grand work on the Inquisition, have promptly followed volume I. which was noticed in these pages in the January issue, and like that they are monuments of the amazing industry and historical erudition of the author, of his judicial fairness and calm, impartial discrimination. The second volume relates the conduct of the Inquisition in the several lands of Christendom, Languedoc, France, the Spanish Peninsula, Italy, Germany, Bohemia and among the Slavic Cathari, with a full chapter of the persecution and crusades against the Hussites.

Volume III. surveys special fields of Inquisitorial activity, including chapters on political heresy utilized by the Church and by the State, on sorcery and occult arts, and on witchcraft.

These tragic subjects, involving as they do tales of superhuman cruelty, are handled with dispassionate coolness, with no fondness for dilating on the horrible, and with but little effort at moralizing or philosophizing. It was evidently the author's supreme purpose to get at the facts in the case, to state them with fair-minded, straight-forward faithfulness and to let the remorseless recital stand as the colorless, terrible truth of history. The case of Huss, for example, the most conspicuous instance of an inquisitorial process on record, the author maintains does



not especially exhibit a wilful perversity and pitiless denial of justice on the part of the Council, but rather it enables us to obtain a measure of the infamy of the system and to form an estimate, in some degree, of the innumerable wrongs inflicted on countless thousands of obscure and forgotten victims.

That such a work should be accurate in every historical statement or inference would be to attach to it the quality of inspiration. It is, however, mainly in such references as lie outside of its proper horizon that we think we find slight deviations from the truth of history. More light is wanted than we now have, for instance, to prove that the Moravians who settled in Pennsylvania have any essential connection with the Hussites. Again, while Mr. Lea clearly sees that in the Reformation "the hour, the place and the man had met by a happy concurrence," we believe that he has no warrant for saying "that the reformers were as rigid as the orthodox in setting bounds to dogmatic independence." His impartiality must have forsaken him when he went beyond the province of his work. Such defects are however rare, and we feel that the most unstinted praise of these volumes is not extravagant. They constitute undoubtedly the most able, the most comprehensive and most satisfactory work yet written on the Inquisition and form one of the most important contributions of the age to historical literature. It curdles one's blood to read some of its pages, and its revelations may be found horrible rather than fascinating, but the reader will also be thrilled to see from what frightful institutions society was delivered by the Reformation, and what influences helped to hasten that crisis and to render it inevitable.

---

#### IV. PRACTICAL.

*Current Religious Perils.* With Preludes and other Addresses on Leading Reforms and a Symposium on Vital and Progressive Orthodoxy. By Joseph Cook. 8vo. pp. 435. \$2.00. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin & Co. On sale by J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.

Who Mr. Cook is, what he has to say and how he is wont to say it, is pretty generally known to our readers. He holds to the old order, and that with a measure of intensity and positiveness that is sure to produce conviction in his audience. He is a speaker who not only agrees with himself, but who wields that power which makes his hearers agree with him. That Boston still gives him crowded houses at midday throughout the week is testimony that neither the speaker nor orthodoxy has lost interest with the public and is in fact one of the most grateful signs of the times. And a careful study of this volume, which is considerably beyond the size of its ten predecessors, shows that in freshness,

timeliness and vigor Mr. Cook's standard is fully maintained, while the importance of the subjects discussed yields nothing to the earlier lectures which gave to him his world-wide fame.

Waste of Opportunity, the Chief Peril of the Church, is the subject of the first lecture. Others are Modern Novel Opportunity in Philosophy, in Theology, in Ethical Science, in the Spiritual Life, in Comparative Religion, in New Political Outgrowths of Christianity.

The preludes grapple the principal issues of Current Reform Movements, such as Lord's Day Lawlessness, The Indian, Illiteracy, Mormons, &c. One is devoted to Henry Ward Beecher as Preacher and Reformer.

A series of addresses is added on such questions as Scriptural and Speculative Standards of Orthodoxy, Arbitration as a Remedy for War, The Future of Cities and of the Liquor Traffic, Promises and Perils of the Temperance Reform. Also a Symposium on Current Religious Perils, in which a number of the foremost thinkers in the country participate.

The most phenomenal features of Mr. Cook are the extraordinary range of his intellect and the extent of his reading, reaching from the most abstract and abstruse questions in philosophy to the common every day topics of practical morals or political reform. He is a potent factor in almost every province of the evolution of modern thought, but he goes far wrong sometimes, as in the case of the government taxing whiskey, which he holds makes it a partaker in the crimes of the traffic.

*Die Evangelien des Kirchenjahres* erklärt durch Beispielen aus der Heiligen Schrift, Sinnsprüche, Kurze Erzählungen aus dem Leben, &c. Von L. Krummel, Lic. Theol. Pfarrer in Sandhausen bei Heidelberg. Philadelphia: Schaeffer & Koradi.

This is an ingenious and attractive compilation of valuable material illustrative of the gospel pericopes, intended for the use of clergymen, Sunday-school teachers and the heads of families.

The gospel selection is given in full, illustrated by other passages, parallel and explanatory. Then follow admirably chosen quotations from the writings of Luther, Herberger, Arndt, Scriver, Rieger, Löhe, Ahlfeld, Lange and others, with special reference to the historical, exegetical, geographical or archæological features of the text. Then the author gives an original or selected statement of the substance of the pericope. And this is followed by an entertaining and instructive collection of fragmentary illustrations, consisting of stanzas of poetry, prayers, aphorism, anecdotes, &c.

The work is being published in 8 parts, each 64 pp., at 20 cents each.

*Neue Folge der Sammlung von Beispielen* über biblische Hauptbegriffe &c., in alphabetischer Reihenfolge. Ein Handbuch für Geistliche, Lehrer, Soutagsschullehrer und die Familie. Von A. Rodemyer.

8vo. pp. 812, Basel: Ferd Riehm; Philadelphia: Schaeffer & Koriadi.

Reference to this notable collection of illustrations has been made several times in these pages, and now we hail with much satisfaction the appearance of a new issue, the first one of 2500 copies having been exhausted in less than a year.

The plan followed in this work commends itself to all teachers and public speakers. The subjects illustrated are given in alphabetical order and under each one separately we have 1. texts of Scripture which bear upon it, 2. scriptural examples and similes, 3. other similitudes, 4. proverbs and striking observations, 5. aphorisms, 6. anecdotes from life. A complete outline of a topic is thus furnished at sight, and in these busy times with the hurried preparations that are often required such material made ready-to-hand is of incalculable service. What is needed is that the selections in such a compilation should be made with intelligence, care and good taste, and the presence of these qualities is very clearly attested page by page.

We know of no work in the English tongue that is so well adapted to the purpose of such a manual. And that it is of German origin and issued only in that language makes it peculiarly desirable to all who have any knowledge of that tongue. Choice and forcible illustrations and striking anecdotes furnished in English collections are familiar to men who employ such aids, and they are also becoming so familiar to their auditors and readers that it is hardly safe to use them anywhere. Here we have hundreds of good things which are yet buried out of sight for those who see only with English glasses, and besides the light they throw on given subjects, they have the merit of freshness, although these omnivorous Germans get hold also of some good American and English "chestnuts." All who have the opportunity and responsibility of teaching whether in the Church, or school or home will find themselves greatly enriched by the possession of this volume. It is beautifully printed.

*Textgemässe Predigt-Entwürfe.* Von J. Heinrich Schultze, Dritte Auflage. pp. 140. 8vo. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht's Verlag.

This is the first of three larger pamphlets containing skeletons on the gospels and epistles of the church-year and on two series of free texts. The present pamphlet treats of the gospels only. As this is already the third edition, it is evident that these sermon outlines have been received with favor in Germany. This they merit. Exegetically and homiletically they are excellent, although in some cases not after the manner of preaching in favor in America.

*Some Aspects of the Blessed Life.* By Mark Guy Pearse. pp. 222. 1887. New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stone.

Many words of high praise may be given to these twelve expositions of scripture, all of which touch more or less on different phases of the blessed life of the true child of God. The book is suggestive, rich in imagery. The author's spirit is devout. He has rare insight into the higher truths of the hidden life with God in Christ. There is nervous strength in many of his sentences. As an expositor he is felicitous. One is apt to return to his inspiring thought and read again and again the stirring words. It is a good book to put into the hands of the Christian.

C. S. A.

*Five-Minute Sermons to Children.* By Rev William Armstrong, of the Genesee Conference. pp. 203. 80cts. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

It is a cheering sign of the times to see this species of literature multiplying. To depend on the instruction of the Sunday-school for the spiritual training of the young is found illusory, and conscientious ministers are getting their eyes opened to the literal significance to them of the great charge: "Feed my lambs." Many of them feel doubtless as did the author of these 100 five-minute talks, that it is impossible for them to preach to children, but if they were willing to give the subject the attention which it demands, if, like our author, they would study the children at their homes and in the streets, at schools and picnics, in their troubles and their joys, they would also doubtless have to confess that the material of thought and incident had grown to dimensions sufficient for a large volume.

Sympathy with children, a careful observation of their characteristics, and an enlightened faith in their religious capacities, are of course prerequisite to the adaptation of the gospel to their minds, and no models furnished by other men can be a substitute for these. But the substance and the language of Mr. Armstrong's bright, short, crisp, pointed sermons, offer a very fair sample of effective preaching to children. They hold a commendable mean between childish silliness and rhetorical fustian. They are well aimed for direct impressions upon youthful minds, but they often find mark in hearts much older and harder. We should like to hear such sermons in every sanctuary every Lord's day, and we should expect incalculable blessings to flow from them.

*The Risen Christ, the King of Men.* By James Baldwin Brown, B. A., Author of "The Divine Life in Man," "First Principles of Ecclesiastical Truth," "The Christian Policy of Life," "The Divine Mysteries," "The Higher Life," etc. pp. 368. Price \$2.00. New York: Thomas Whittaker, Bible House.

This subject is treated in a series of discourses—sixteen in all—which

make a valuable work in the line of Christian Evidences. The "Resurrection of Christ" is the central theme and its treatment here is quite exhaustive. The first half were intended by the author as part of a book he was preparing in 1879, but broken health and death intervening he did not finish it. Some time since his wife made a collection of sermons from his manuscripts, showing the influence of the Resurrection in the development of humanity. This collection constitutes the latter half of the work and fits well with what preceded. The discourses come from a vigorous, well informed and logical mind, and make an excellent companion volume to a more compact discussion of the Resurrection usually found in works on the "Evidences of Christianity."

*Christianity in the Daily Conduct of Life.* Studies of Texts Relating to Principles of the Christian Character. pp. 338. Price \$1.50. New York: Thomas Whittaker, 2 and 3 Bible House.

A variety of subjects here but well unified in the title of the book. Some of them are, Christian humility, Christian forgiveness, Christian anger, Christian profession and use of wealth, Christian giving, the sin of Ananias and Sapphira, Christ's followers in society, the Christian sense of heavenly citizenship. The different chapters are sermons, which, while they show the art of the homiletician, are without the ordinary stiffness of the average sermon, and as free as a discussion of each subject without the hampering influence of a text. The views presented are discriminating in their treatment and safe in their practical application. Rhetorically they are severely plain, lacking in illustrations and striking figures, but rather interesting for all this. We commend them for their healthful teaching.

*Sermons.* By H. P. Liddon, D. D., D. C. L., Canon of St. Paul's pp. 192. Price \$1.00. New York: Thomas Whittaker, Bible House.

Canon Liddon's name gives assurance that these sermons are of no ordinary grade. The reader will not have them long in hand before receiving a confirmation of this. The "practical" is here in such sermons as "The Premature Judgments of Man" and "Stewardship;" fidelity to church work in such as that on "Foreign Missions;" and the doctrinal in "The Incarnation." The time and place when each one was preached are given. All, so far as we have noticed, were delivered in St. Paul's Cathedral, London. Those on "The Pharisee and the Publican" and "The Incarnation" strike us as having special excellence, although all are good.

*New Science of Elocution.* The Elements and Principles of Vocal Expression in Lessons, with Exercises and Selections systematically  
VOL. XVIII. No. 3.

arranged for acquiring the Art of Reading and Speaking. By S. S. Hamill, A. M. pp. 382. Cloth \$1.00. Phila.: J. B. Lippincott. Co.

He is a bold man who to-day offers to the public a new book on Elocution; not so much on account of the multitude of such works already in the market as on account of the ill-repute in which elocution has come to be held by the many who have a hatred of the artificial. The ostentatious parade of gesture, inflections and "voice work" which is usually presented as the fruit of the study of elocution, and the pride of schools of oratory are as far from true "vocal expression" as cheap stained glass is from French plate, obscuring rather than revealing thought by drawing attention to itself. If that be elocution the less of it the better.

But we are disposed to blame the student and the teacher, not the study, for this prejudice. Although Delsarte's declaration that "Manner, as much as matter, constitutes eloquence" is obviously the biased opinion of a specialist in "manner," yet there is indisputably truth in in what he says. And that "manner"—voice, gesture, etc.—can be cultivated and improved by practice, not theory, has again and again been proved. The reason the study of elocution so commonly leads to artificiality is either because it is made a showy end in itself, not the ever subordinate instrument of a high purpose, and consequently is mechanical and unnatural, or else because the practice and study of the art stops too soon. Here as nowhere else real art is to conceal art; and not for one moment, in ideal expression, must our attention be drawn to the way the spell is being woven around us by any awkwardness or hesitation or, above all, obtrusiveness in the orator's action. This is possible only when "manner" has become second nature through long practice. In order not to have his audience think of his voice and body, the orator must not think of them. When he has studied elocution until he practices it unconsciously, then the elocutionist, with a thought behind him, rises into the orator; the stained glass becomes plate glass, and the fiery purpose or thought pours down its warming rays unobstructed. Then we see the force of Burleigh's definition: "Eloquence is vehement simplicity."

The book before us is specially adapted for work in schools, being divided into lessons, each of which contains, besides the theoretical principles, carefully selected exercises upon them. The exercises are of high literary quality, and the hints concerning their rendition judicious and not over mechanical. For the average teacher's work in the class room this is one of the most promising books we have seen.

## V. GENERAL LITERATURE.

*Witness to Christ.* A Contribution to Christian Apologetics. By William Clark, M. A., Professor of Philosophy in Trinity College, Toronto. pp. 300. 1888. Price \$1.50. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co.

This book presents the "Baldwin Lectures" for 1887, on the Foundation recently established at the University of Michigan, the first series of which were given by Bishop A. Cleveland Coxe and published a year ago as "Institutes of Christian History." Their object has been to deal with the questions which contemporaneous thought has raised in relation to the divine authority of Christianity and its leading truths. The range of topics discussed cover the chief points made prominent by recent skeptical criticism.

The first lecture reviews the Phases and Failures of Unbelief, tracing them in the three forms in which they have been presenting themselves, *Rationalism*, *Mythicisim* and *Materialism*, and exhibiting the present tendencies and indications. The result of these unceasing, shifting attacks on Christian truth, and of their constant failures, is viewed as continually giving this truth a clearer and more unquestionable victory, as the resources of skepticism are being exhausted in vain. The second lecture treats of Civilization and Christianity, and, over against infidel complaints, traces, in rapid but impressive outline, what the Gospel has done for mankind. The Power of Christianity for Personal Culture, examined in the third lecture, exhibits its incomparable superiority to all other forces, and its necessity for the realization of true manhood. These lectures are followed by others on The Unity of Christian Doctrine, The Insufficiency of Materialism, The Pessimism of the Age, and two on The Resurrection of Jesus Christ. The first of these two presents the evidences for the resurrection, and the second examines the theories invented to set aside this evidence.

The whole discussion is marked by scholarly ability and familiar acquaintance with the course of modern conflict over the various questions, and with the literature of the subject, especially in its philosophical aspects. Though not the production of a specialist, it gathers and presents to the reader a fair exhibit of the results of special scholarship on the great theme. Its temper is calm and candid, erring if at all in this particular, by a excessive readiness to make concession to the force of opposite views, but assuring thereby the stronger confidence of the reader in the positive conclusions reached in the examination. M. V.

*Introduction to the Study of Philosophy.* By J. H. W. Stuckenberg, D. D. pp. 422. 12mo. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. For sale by J. B. Lippincott Co., Phila.

Dr. Stuckenberg's scholarly ability, and enthusiastic self-devotion, for years, to the problems and history of philosophy, awaken expectations



of more than ordinary merit in a work from his pen on this subject. An examination of the work fully sustains this just expectation. The task which he here set for himself was one of great difficulty. An immense field had to be surveyed, and out of the confusion of thought and method in the realm of philosophy, its true sphere and just principles had to be sought and settled. The volume throughout shows the breadth and thoroughness of his acquaintance with philosophy, the force and subtlety of his analysis and discriminations, and the prevailing justness of his judgment.

As indicated by the title, the purpose of the work is not to present a philosophic system, but to help students who are beginning the study of philosophy to a correct conception of its sphere and function and settlement of the principles which must guide and regulate inquiry and conclusions. It is meant to guard the student against the numerous mistakes to which he is liable, arising not only from the inherent difficulties of the study, but from the numerous conflicting notions respecting its true nature and right methods.

The introductory statements vindicate the need and demand for philosophy and set forth the importance of its office or service in the interest of truth and life. The first chapter seeks a definition of philosophy, tracing the use of the word in the past, and reaching a definition which the aggregate history of it shows to be a just statement of its aim and function. This definition sums it up as "the rational system of fundamental principles." The second chapter, on the relation of philosophy to religion, is rich in important and judicious discriminations. The third, inquiring into the relations between philosophy and natural science, shows the need of this discipline and its results to complete the investigation of the realities which science examines. Its connection with empirical psychology is considered in the fourth chapter. With a definition thus established and these relations indicated, Dr. Stuckenberg proceeds to indicate the special lines of inquiry along which the problems of philosophy are to be found, and presents a division of its whole subject matter. He makes this division into, 1. Metaphysics; 2. The Theory of Knowledge; 3. Aesthetics; 4. Ethics. The problems for investigation in these branches are traced, with helpful suggestions as to the principles for their solution. The work concludes with a discussion of the spirit and method of the entire study.

We are, of course, not expected to agree with every view presented in a work of this kind, traversing the wide expanse of philosophical thought. But the prevailing justness of discrimination throughout this work, the depth of its philosophical spirit, and its clear exhibition of the leading essential principles of the study to which it offers itself as an introduction, make it a volume of high value and worthy of the wide and growing reputation of the author.

M. V.

*Women and Men.* By Thomas Wentworth Higginson, author of "A Larger History of the United States," &c. pp. 326. 16mo. Cloth. \$1.00. New York: Harper & Brothers, Franklin Square.

Graceful language, charming wit, cheerful philosophy and wholesome moral and social lessons mark all the productions of Mr. Higginson's ready and busy pen. We have few writers who have greater popularity among our cultured reading classes.

The present volume consists of a number of brief essays on social topics, which will be found not only quite enjoyable both to women and men—especially to women,—but sufficiently practical and pointed to be profitable for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness, justice, taste and good manners. It is fortunate for society that it has such teachers and that their teaching comes in so attractive a garb as to be almost irresistible.

*Woman, First and Last, and What She Has Done.* By Mrs. E. J. Richmond, author of "The Jeweled Serpent," "Zoa Rodman," "Drifting and Anchored," "Alice Grant," etc., etc. 2 Vols. pp. 271, 300. \$1.00 per vol. New York: Phillips & Hunt. On sale by J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.

These two volumes are made up of sixty-five hasty, lively sketches of famous women, beginning with Eve, the Wives of the Patriarchs, Miriam, Deborah, &c., and closing with Queen Victoria, Florence Nightingale, Charlotte Brontë, Harriet Beecher Stowe and Harriet Hosmer.

The author's purpose in sending forth this work is, in her own words, to prove from these accumulated testimonies the power of woman for good or evil. "The stern logic of facts" has convinced her that intellect has no sex; "that he who attempts to define 'woman's sphere' is closely allied to the fabled giant with his iron bedstead."

What pains have been taken to gather and to marshal the "facts," we have not read far enough to form a final judgment, but when in the sketch of the shameless Catharine of Russia we found mention made of "her excellent character" our reading came to a sudden halt. Many readers will enjoy the entertainment offered by such a work and it will contribute much to their store of information, but nothing detracts so much from the merit of authorship as the want of accuracy and discrimination.

*Parliamentary Practice.* By T. B. Neely, D. D. Tenth Thousand. Revised Edition. pp. 82. Cloth, 25 cts. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

The critic is not a parliamentarian but from the strong endorsement this manual has commanded from eminent parliamentarians it may be regarded as a standard. It is a condensation of a number of works which have long been recognized as authorities and is so convenient in form that it can be carried in one's vest pocket ready for instant use.

*Lost on an Island.* By Mrs. Virginia C. Phœbus. 1887. pp. 216.  
New York: Phillips & Hunt. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe.

Mrs. Phœbus has written several shorter sketches dealing with natural science. In this volume, she has given a great number of scientific observations woven around the adventures of a father and daughter cast ashore on an atoll of the Pacific Ocean. The book is written in an agreeable and attractive style for young readers, conveying to them, in our modern method, much information in a bright, sketchy way. It will benefit those who will not study the severer scientific works and may incite younger minds to a more thorough examination of the subjects touched upon. It is a most desirable book of its kind for Sunday-school libraries.

*Young Folks' Nature Studies.* By Virginia C. Phœbus. pp. 258.  
\$1.00. New York: Phillips & Hunt.

The first part of these "studies" pertains to the ants, the second to coal formations and the third to fossils. The discussion is carried on in the form of a dialogue, a pair of twin sisters aged fifteen years taking a lively interest in the conversation, propounding staggering inquiries and making sapient reflections. The author shows her mastery of thought and language in producing a book which is not only adapted to juveniles at fifteen, but which is quite intelligible to younger minds and which will fascinate readers of maturer intellect. The stories about the ants sound like fairy-tales, but when authorities like Dr. McCook and Sir John Lubbock vouch for their truth, we must accept them as sober but marvelous facts, remembering the adage that truth is stranger than fiction.

Books like this ought to go wherever there are children. They will prove an agreeable and healthful substitute for the attractive literary trash which is so abundant. They are sure to promote alike mental and moral improvement along with wholesome diversion.

*Synodal-Handbuch der deutschen ev.-luth. Synode von Missouri, Ohio und anderen Staaten.* Auf Beschluss der Synode zusammengestellt, Gal. 5: 1; 1 Cor. 14: 40. Dritte, auf Beschluss der Synode revidirte Auflage. 12mo. pp. 134. St. Louis, Mo.: Concordia Publishing House, M. C. Barthel, Supt.

This little volume is a revelation. We stand amazed at the rapid growth and wonderful vigor of the synodical organizations it describes and of the literary and theological and eleemosynary institutions whose statutes and modes of operation it sets forth. One cannot read these constitutions and charters, these rules and regulations, these disciplinary statutes and ordinances, without a feeling of exultation that the Lutheran Church has so admirable an opportunity on the soil of free America to develop and practically exercise her truly liberal principles,

unhindered by the arm of civil authority. We rejoice to see that under the restraint of a truly devout and sound conservatism these Missourians did not rush to a lawless extreme, but quietly and judiciously organized a system of ecclesiastical government almost the exact counterpart of that so successfully developed in the General Synod.

The volume opens with the "Constitution of the German Evangelical Lutheran Synod of Missouri, Ohio and other States;" naming the conditions under which connection with it can be entered upon and maintained; claiming to decide all questions of doctrine and of conscience by the word of God and all others by a vote of the majority; declaring the synod to be merely an advisory body, as regards the self-government of the individual congregations.

The district synods, of which there are already *twelve*, are among other things obligated to make inquiry in their respective congregations in regard to the reading of the Bible, the practice of family worship, of domestic discipline, attendance at preparatory service, at public worship and at the Lord's Supper, the selection and use of religious literature, the prevalence of separatistic tendencies among their people, the holding of private conventicles, attendance upon the lodges of secret societies, and, in general, in regard to the state of religion among their people.

It is made the duty of the presidents of the district synods, in connection with at least one neighboring minister, to ordain and install newly elected pastors. "The so-called license" being deemed "contrary to scripture and all ecclesiastical custom [in our Church]."

The examination of applicants for ordination is rigid and thorough. Those who have enjoyed a full literary and theological training are examined, as a rule, in the Latin language. Those who have had only a practical training for the sacred office are examined in German.

A chronicler is appointed by the Synod whose duty it is "to record chronologically and truthfully, with the sanction of the Synod, the most remarkable events and movements within the American Lutheran Church of the present, her struggles, and the effect wrought upon her by influences from without, and thus to furnish continuous contributions for a chronicle of the American Lutheran Church."

The President of each District Synod is required to visit each charge within his supervision at least once during his term of office [three years] and report concerning it to his Synod. He must also attend all the Conference meetings, and send a quarterly report of his official acts to the General President.

This General President "exercises a supervision over all the other officers, viz., the President of the District Synods, all the appointees of the General Synod, *e. g.* the teachers in the Seminaries and Gymnasiums, the general agents, the superintending Boards, and the District

Synods as such." He is, as a rule, to visit annually all the literary institutions of the Synod.

We have noticed so many features of the constitution of the Synod, that we have left no room for comment upon the charters of the various literary, theological and charitable institutions under its control. These, along with its vast Publication House in St. Louis, are attracting the admiration of the general public, that looks with amazement at the growth of these various establishments, all the fruit of the pious zeal and self-sacrifice of these humble foreigners whose leaders fled hither from persecution.

C. A. H.

---

The following valuable books have been received and reviews of them may be expected in our next issue:

*The Ancient World and Christianity.* By E. D. Pressensé, D. D., Author of "The Early Years of Christianity," etc. pp. 479. Price \$1.75. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. On sale by J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.

*Sacred History from the Creation to the Giving of the Law.* By Edward P. Humphrey, D. D., LL. D., Sometime Professor in the Danville Theological Seminary. pp. 550. Price \$3.50. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. On sale by J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia.

*An Introduction to Dogmatic Theology.* Based on Luthardt. By Revere Franklin Weidner, S. T. D., Professor of Theology in Augustana Theological Seminary, etc., etc. pp. 260. Rock Island: Augustana Book Concern. On sale by Lutheran Publication House, Philadelphia.

#### PAMPHLETS.

*Shall We Have a Bishop? or the Episcopate* for the Lutheran Church in America. By Rev. J. Kohler, Pastor of Zion's Lutheran Church, Leacock, Penna.

*Christian Unity.* By the same.

*Born of Water and the Spirit.* An Exegesis of Jno. 3: 5, by Rev. J. H. Hughes, Franklin Park, Mass.

---

In the notice of the excellent *Bird's-Eye View of Gettysburg* published by Fowler & Downs (see April No., p. 290), it should have been stated that orders are to be addressed to T. M. Fowler, Morrisville, Pa.